

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, June 23, 1992

The House met at 12 noon.

Rev. Richard Downing, rector, St. James Episcopal Church on Capitol Hill, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, we praise Thee for all Thou hast done for us as a nation. Deepen the root of our national life in Thy everlasting righteousness, lest Thy blessing be withdrawn. Make us equal to our high trusts, reverent in the use of freedom, just in the exercise of power, and generous in the protection of weakness. Inspire all who direct this Nation, that they may guide it wisely and well; give insight and faithfulness to our legislators; and may our deepest trust ever be in Thee, the Lord of all nations and the King of kings; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed until the end of the legislative day.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I send a privileged motion to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a

quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 17, nays 379, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

## YEAS—17

Allard	DeLay	Johnson (TX)
Armey	Doolittle	Livingston
Clinger	Fields	Matsul
Cox (CA)	Gunderson	Schulze
Crane	Hancock	Weber
Dannemeyer	Hefley	

## NAYS—379

Abercrombie	Condit	Goodling
Ackerman	Conyers	Gordon
Alexander	Cooper	Goss
Anderson	Costello	Gradison
Andrews (ME)	Coughlin	Grandy
Andrews (NJ)	Cox (IL)	Green
Andrews (TX)	Coyne	Guarini
Annunzio	Cramer	Hall (OH)
Anthony	Cunningham	Hall (TX)
Applegate	Darden	Hamilton
Archer	de la Garza	Hammerschmidt
Aspin	DeFazio	Hansen
Atkins	DeLauro	Harris
AuCoin	Derrick	Hastert
Baker	Dickinson	Hatcher
Ballenger	Dicks	Hayes (IL)
Barnard	Dingell	Hayes (LA)
Barrett	Donnelly	Henry
Barton	Dooley	Herger
Bateman	Dorgan (ND)	Hertel
Bellenson	Dornan (CA)	Hoagland
Bennett	Downey	Hobson
Bentley	Dreier	Hochbrueckner
Bereuter	Duncan	Holloway
Berman	Durbin	Hopkins
Bevill	Dwyer	Horn
Billbray	Dymally	Horton
Billirakis	Early	Houghton
Blackwell	Eckart	Hoyer
Bliley	Edwards (CA)	Hubbard
Boehlert	Edwards (TX)	Huckaby
Boehner	Emerson	Hughes
Borski	Engel	Hunter
Boucher	English	Hutto
Boxer	Erdreich	Hyde
Brewster	Espy	Inhofe
Brooks	Evans	Ireland
Broomfield	Ewing	Jacobs
Browder	Fascell	James
Brown	Fawell	Jefferson
Bruce	Fazio	Jenkins
Bryant	Fish	Johnson (CT)
Bunning	Flake	Johnson (SD)
Burton	Ford (MI)	Johnston
Bustamante	Frank (MA)	Jones (NC)
Byron	Franks (CT)	Jontz
Callahan	Frost	Kanjorski
Camp	Gallegly	Kasich
Campbell (CA)	Gallo	Kennedy
Cardin	Gaydos	Kennelly
Carper	Gejdenson	Kildee
Carr	Gekas	Kleczka
Chandler	Gephardt	Klug
Clay	Geren	Kolbe
Clement	Gibbons	Kolter
Coble	Gillmor	Kopetski
Coleman (MO)	Gilman	Kostmayer
Coleman (TX)	Gingrich	Kyl
Collins (IL)	Glickman	LaFalce
Combest	Gonzalez	Lagomarsino

Lancaster	Orton	Sikorski
Lantos	Owens (NY)	Sisisky
LaRocco	Owens (UT)	Skaggs
Laughlin	Oxley	Skeen
Leach	Packard	Slattery
Lehman (CA)	Pallone	Slaughter
Levin (MI)	Panetta	Smith (FL)
Lewis (CA)	Parker	Smith (IA)
Lewis (FL)	Pastor	Smith (NJ)
Lewis (GA)	Patterson	Smith (OR)
Lightfoot	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Payne (VA)	Snowe
Lloyd	Pelosi	Solarz
Long	Penny	Solomon
Lowery (CA)	Peterson (FL)	Spence
Lowey (NY)	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Luken	Petri	Staggers
Machtley	Pickett	Stark
Manton	Pickle	Stearns
Markey	Porter	Stenholm
Martin	Poshard	Stokes
Mavroules	Price	Studds
Mazzoli	Pursell	Stump
McCandless	Quillen	Sundquist
McCloskey	Rahall	Swett
McCrery	Ramstad	Swift
McCurdy	Rangel	Synar
McDade	Ravenel	Tallon
McEwen	Ray	Tanner
McGrath	Reed	Tauzin
McHugh	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McMillan (NC)	Rhodes	Taylor (NC)
McMillen (MD)	Richardson	Thomas (CA)
Meyers	Riggs	Thomas (GA)
Mfume	Rinaldo	Thomas (WY)
Michel	Ritter	Thornton
Miller (CA)	Roberts	Torres
Miller (OH)	Roe	Torricelli
Miller (WA)	Roemer	Trafficant
Mineta	Rogers	Unsoeld
Mink	Rohrabacher	Upton
Moakley	Ros-Lehtinen	Vander Jagt
Molinari	Rose	Vento
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Visclosky
Montgomery	Roth	Volkmer
Moody	Roukema	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Rowland	Walker
Moran	Roybal	Walsh
Morella	Russo	Waxman
Morrison	Sabo	Weiss
Mrazek	Sanders	Weldon
Murphy	Sangmeister	Whitton
Murtha	Santorum	Williams
Myers	Sarpalio	Wilson
Nagle	Sawyer	Wolf
Natcher	Saxton	Wolpe
Neal (MA)	Schaefer	Wyden
Neal (NC)	Scheuer	Wyllie
Nichols	Schiff	Yates
Nowak	Schroeder	Yatron
Nussle	Schumer	Young (AK)
Oaker	Sensenbrenner	Young (FL)
Oberstar	Serrano	Zeliff
Obey	Sharp	Zimmer
Olin	Shaw	
Olver	Shays	
Ortiz	Shuster	

## NOT VOTING—38

Allen	Gilchrest	Pease
Bacchus	Hefner	Perkins
Bonior	Jones (GA)	Ridge
Campbell (CO)	Kaptur	Savage
Chapman	Lehman (FL)	Skelton
Collins (MI)	Lent	Stallings
Davis	Levine (CA)	Towns
Dellums	Marienee	Traxler
Dixon	Martinez	Valentine
Edwards (OK)	McCollum	Washington
Feighan	McDermott	Waters
Foglietta	McNulty	Wise
Ford (TN)	Payne (NJ)	

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

□ 1226

Messrs. PANETTA, STUMP, MYERS of Indiana, DOWNEY, DONNELLY, KOPETSKI, and LANCASTER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, and Mr. RANGEL changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ARMEY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HAYES] will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will state his objection.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, according to the opening section of Jefferson's Manual entitled "Importance of Adhering to Rules," section 1, it states:

Mr. Onslow, the ablest among the Speakers of the House of Commons, used to say, "It was a maxim he had often heard when he was a young man, from old and experienced Members, that nothing tended more to throw power into the hands of administration, and those who acted with the majority of the House of Commons, than a neglect of, or departure from, the rules of proceeding; that these forms, as instituted by our ancestors, operated as a check and control on the actions of the majority, and that they were, in many instances, a shelter and protection to the minority, against the attempts of power." So far the maxim is certainly true, and is founded in good sense, that as it is always in the power of the majority, by their numbers, to stop any improper measures proposed on the part of their opponents, the only weapons by which the minority can defend themselves against similar attempts from those in power are the forms and rules of proceeding which have been adopted as they were found necessary, from time to time, and are become the law of the House, by a strict adherence to which the weaker party can only be protected from those irregularities and abuses which these forms were intended to check—

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

□ 1230

The gentleman from North Dakota may not give his 1-minute speech. Objection is heard.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Objection is heard.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Chair would advise Members that if they wish to object, they should please stand, so that the Chair will see the objector.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object to the Members—

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### CONGRESS MUST REAUTHORIZE EXPIRING TAX PROVISIONS

(Mr. BARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, at the end of June, just a few days away, a dozen popular and effective tax breaks for businesses and individuals are scheduled to expire. I'm frustrated that, to date, there has been no positive indication that this body will move to extend these revenue provisions.

I now hear this morning, that the Ways and Means Committee will begin markup of a bill tomorrow, but with no promise of floor action anytime soon.

Maybe it will be July; but maybe doesn't cut it, for the many small businesses that are especially dependent on five of these tax provisions.

I think it's unfortunate that we are leaving millions in limbo, unable to plan for future businesses expenses and tax liabilities, while we dawdle here in Congress. This is not the approach that stimulates the economy.

Some of the expiring tax provisions include:

Credits for business research and experimentation;

Credits for low-income housing development;

The 25-percent deduction for health insurance costs of the self-employed;

States' authority to issue tax-exempt mortgage-revenue bonds and small-issue manufacturing bonds;

Exclusion of employer-provided education assistance and group legal services from taxes;

Tax credits for clinical testing of orphan drugs; and

The targeted jobs tax credit for hiring disabled and disadvantaged workers.

These tax provisions are not trivial, and far too many times in the past, they've been used as hostages to get Members to support tax increases. I hope that's not what the future holds this time around.

We should permanently extend these tax provisions and avoid the current situation in the future. I urge the Ways and Means Committee to act quickly, cleanly, and get a bill to the floor, and passed, before more precious time elapses.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object—

Mr. HOYER. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object if I have an opportunity to explain what I regard as a serious breach of the process of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would inform the gentleman that he can seek recognition for 1-minute and be recognized.

Mr. WALKER. I am proceeding under the rules of the House by reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and all I am attempting to do is to remind the Members of the process by which we are supposed to operate, and then I will not object, and I will allow the gen-



tleman to proceed. But I think we have had a serious breach of the processes of the House with regard to potential legislation coming forward.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Regular order.

Mr. WALKER. And I intend to bring that to the attention of the Members by utilizing the rules.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is trying to be fair to the gentleman. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

#### REQUEST BY MEMBER TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, the problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that in the next few days there is going to be an attempt to take Republican Members off their feet—

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Regular order.

Mr. WALKER. Who would like to offer amendments to the legislative appropriations bill. And it is being done by using the power of the majority.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SOLOMON. You want regular order? I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. WALKER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from New York object? The Chair did not see the gentleman.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. I objected, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair did not see the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. I object, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Objection is heard.

#### OPEN UP THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

#### SUPREME COURT RULING ON FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I feel I must speak out against the deplorable ruling made by our so-called Supreme Court yesterday. The Court ruled that cities and States cannot ban a form of speech or expression solely on its content. The court has, in effect, unanimously agreed to endorse terrorists acts under the first amendment. While I agree that individuals in a democracy such as ours have the right to voice their opinions, they do not have the right to express themselves in a manner which denies others their civil rights. The Supreme Court in all of its scholarly wisdom, has failed to realize that while it has a responsibility to uphold the liberties guaranteed by our Constitution, it is bound to respect the rights of minority groups in this Nation. To burn a cross in your own yard is freedom of expression, to burn it on your neighbors is a terrorist act. I disagree with Chief Justice Scalia, who wrote that there are other means to punish the offenders without adding the first amendment to the fire. This ruling sends a message to hatemongers across the country, that it is your birthright as an American citizen to terrorize those who because of race, ethnicity, or religion differ from you. Mr. Speaker, this is a dangerous message. The Supreme Court is carrying the true foundations of our Nation—truth, justice, and humanity—out on a stretcher. The Justices are pallbearers at a funeral for hope attended by many of the disenfranchised of this Nation. It is truly a dark day in Washington.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I yield back to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GOSS. I reclaim the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 35 seconds remaining.

#### OPEN UP THE BUDGET PROCESS

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, Congress has its hands on a lot of big spending pro-

posals. But when it comes time to cut the waste, it seems too few of the Members in Congress are given any kind of real grip on the process at all. Billions of dollars—hundreds of billions—will be funneled through this body in the coming months, yet relatively few congressional leaders will be allowed to scrutinize and decide what goes into and what comes out of these spending bills. The rest of us—the great majority of the membership—are voiceless, literally cut off from meaningful debate, even unable in some cases to offer amendments to strip waste.

Mr. Speaker, there's a lot of talk about fundamental changes in the way Congress works. But one simple change would be to ensure that every spending bill be subject to waste-cutting amendments. Many Americans are saying this is no longer the people's house but the house of perks and pork. I suggest we reaffirm our commitment to better handle the people's money by having open rules for all appropriations bills.

#### A MORATORIUM ON THE BURNING OF HAZARDOUS WASTE

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing and a disquieting movement around the country to have hazardous waste burned as fuel in cement kilns. We have that same situation in Jefferson County, KY, where the Kosmos Co. proposes to do just that.

The people in the southwestern part of the county are people mostly of modest income, and they very much object to having their neighborhood become the dumping ground for hazardous waste, and I support that for that reason, along with the possible health hazards to humans, to animal life, and to plant life.

There is a bill, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4413, which would impose a 2-year moratorium on the burning for energy purposes of hazardous waste in these existing boiler facilities.

□ 1240

Mr. Speaker, it would also require the EPA to make a study of the health hazards and the environmental degradation that might come from burning hazardous waste as fuel.

I urge my colleagues, in light of the need to preserve this planet, to get behind the bill, H.R. 4413.

#### AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS NEEDED

(Mr. MILLER of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there have been reports that

the leadership of the House is moving in the direction of closed rules on appropriation bills that would prevent many Members from offering proposals to cut. For example, we have the foreign operations bill coming up this week.

Many of us who have supported foreign assistance believe the time has come for reform and some pruning. We want to be able to offer our amendments.

Just a couple of weeks ago the leadership defeated a balanced budget amendment, and the argument was made that instead of a constitutional amendment, we should just go ahead and make proposals to cut and vote on them.

It ill behooves the House, after turning down that constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget, to now say, "No, you cannot have the opportunity to vote on reductions in appropriations bills."

#### CONCERN ABOUT RECENT SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman states his reservation of the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, I certainly do not intend to object to the gentleman unless we have some attempt here to keep me from making the point that I am attempting to make with regard to the processes of the House.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a minute?

Mr. WALKER. I certainly will yield to the gentleman under my reservation.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Yes. I would like the gentleman to explain his reservation so that we might know, and we can get on with the conduct of our business and the smooth transfer of affairs.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman. That is gracious of him.

The reason why I was attempting to quote from Jefferson's Manual earlier, the most fundamental processes of the House under Jefferson's Manual demand that we have an order of comity in the House that demands decency and makes certain that the majority does not use its power to deny Members their legitimate rights as Members of the House.

I believe that that is beginning to happen with regard to the appropriations process, and I believe the statement of the Speaker yesterday where

he made it clear that not only on the legislative appropriations but perhaps on others they are going to take those rights away from Members of the House is an act of arrogance by the majority that is very, very disturbing to those of us who serve in the minority.

What I was doing here today was an attempt to remind Members that we all operate here under certain rules and processes that get in the way of the orderly process of the House if we apply them strictly. All I am attempting to do is make certain that we do not proceed, as the majority is evidently wanting to proceed, on the legislative appropriation bill in a way that would take away from Members their legitimate right to strike spending from the bill.

I think it is extremely important in the matter of appropriation bills that Members be allowed to strike spending from the bills and that that not be limited, and the fact that we are moving in a way that would tend to limit that I find very disturbing. Now, I will be happy to yield.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman agree that the majority party in the Congress has the right to organize the Congress, set policy, bring bills to the floor as the rules would be described, and are you saying that the Democrat Party, the majority, is in violation specifically of the minority's rights according to law? And would you cite the specific law?

Mr. WALKER. Yes. I would be happy to cite. And that is what I was citing when I was cut off earlier. I was citing from Jefferson's Manual.

Let me quote the last paragraph of what I was citing here which is in the very first section. It says, "And whether these forms," meaning the rules, "be in all cases the most rational or not is really not of so great importance. It is much more material that there should be a rule to go by than what that rule is; that there may be a uniformity of proceeding in business not subject to the caprice of the Speaker or captiousness of the Members. It is very material that order, decency, and regularity be preserved in a public body."

That is what I am concerned is happening here, that the majority is, in fact, moving away from that very fundamental point of Jefferson's rules.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded.

Is there objection to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] and his 1-minute?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is no objection. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio for 1 minute.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court says you can burn the flag, a Communist can work in a defense plant, an American could kidnap a foreign national in their own country, an individual can paint a swastika on their neighbor's barn, an individual can, in fact, burn a cross on their neighbor's yard.

I guess the Supreme Court also says that a private citizen can hire a detective and investigate the President of the United States. A private citizen can, in fact go further than that. They can investigate the family of the President. I guess if you want, a private citizen with enough money could hire enough detectives to, in fact, investigate the Supreme Court and all of their families, Members of Congress, the Senate, and all of our families.

I think there is only one good thing to all of this, Mr. Speaker. It could be the IRS, the FBI, and the CIA performing all of these investigations.

#### RESTRICTIVE RULES ON APPROPRIATION BILLS AN AFFRONT TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE

(Mr. FAWELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my great disappointment with the precedent that appears to be being set by the Appropriations Committee and the Rules Committee as we begin consideration of the fiscal year 1993 appropriations bills.

For the first time since I have come to Congress, the Rules Committee may restrict amendments to appropriation bills. This is absolutely untenable to me. I think this body ought to rise up and defeat any such restrictive rule in order to preserve our right as individual Members to participate in the appropriations process. Further, we must not let a restrictive rule precedent be established.

Two weeks ago we voted down the balanced budget amendment to the Constitution, promising the American people that we could bring Federal spending under control without a constitutional requirement to do so. Now—at a time when open rules are more important than ever to allow Members the opportunity to propose the tough cuts and reductions which are necessary to make good on the promises we made—the Rules Committee may actually, for the first time, limit the number of amendments that may be offered on spending bills.

Now, I understand the supposed rationale for this action. Many of the requested amendments may be similar



and permitting votes on all of them would mean extremely lengthy debate. This is true. But I submit to my colleague and you, Mr. Speaker, that having long debates and making tough choices on how to spend limited resources is exactly what we were sent here to do.

Long debates over how we are spending the taxpayers' money is much more preferable than limited debate on a short list of amendments, which were deemed acceptable to bring to the floor by the majority leadership. One of the reasons we are in the current budget crisis is because we have not seriously weighed and prioritized the various spending items we appropriate for, and I think it is much more responsible to err on the side of too much consideration than too little.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, I think it essential for the Rules Committee to provide open rules for debate on the fiscal year 1993 appropriations bills in order to facilitate, rather than restrict, the opportunity for making the tough spending decisions we promised the American people we were finally willing to make. If open rules are not provided, the Members of this body must reject such rules in order to preserve our right to free and open debate. Failure to reject restrictive rules would signal to the American people that once again we lack the political will to accept the responsibility they have conferred upon us. We will not be able to blame next year's deficit on the Rules Committee. It will rest squarely on those who did not vote to overturn restrictive rules.

Mr. Speaker, we must not let a restrictive rule precedent be set insofar as amendments to appropriations bills are concerned. Such action would be an affront to individual Members of this body as well as an affront to the American people.

#### THE VISION AND LEADERSHIP OF FEDERAL EXPRESS BY DEMONSTRATING CLEAN ALTERNATIVE FUELS IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I will simply tell the gentleman that under the regular procedures of the House, his ability to speak to the House is at the behest of the whole membership, and if we are going to observe regularity in the rules here, then it is incumbent upon the majority to observe regularity in all the rules and not just in this particular instance, and with that, I would certainly be happy to withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection—

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has to ask the House to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, again, to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, last week over 100 nations convening at the Rio summit on the life-threatening issue of global warming called on every nation to analyze the effects of the life cycle of each form of transportation fuel.

Yesterday in Los Angeles, the United States launched the south coast air quality management district alternative fuel demonstration project that will test at least five competing clean alternative motor fuels for economy, efficiency, and emissions.

Thereupon, the Nation begins the process that will result in cleaner air for people and plants living on the Earth's surface; lessen global warming in the atmosphere by reducing greenhouse gases from auto emissions; and, keep dollars at home by reducing U.S. dependence on foreign oil. A one-third reduction of foreign oil imports over 10 years should save our economy about one trillion dollars in foreign energy costs. Imagine what this would do to revitalize our economy.

CLEANFLEET LAUNCH BREAKFAST PROGRAM, SHERATON UNIVERSAL HOTEL, MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1992

Welcoming Remarks: Chairman Henry Wedaa, South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Project Overview: Dr. George M. Sverdrup, Battelle Memorial Institute.

Acknowledgements and Introduction of Speakers: Honorable Norton Younglove, South Coast Air Quality Management District.

Speakers: Ms. Martha Dixon, U.S. Department of Energy; Ms. Katy Gold, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; Mr. John Doyle, California Air Resources Board; Mr. Terry deJonckheere, Ford Motor Co.; Mr. Tony Prince, Chevrolet Motor Division, General Motors; Mr. Warren Tiahart, Dodge Division, Chrysler Corp.; Mr. Ray Lewis, American Methanol Institute; Mr. Fred John, Southern California Gas Co.; Mr. Ivan Jacques, LP Gas Clean Fuels Coalition; Mr. Robert Trunek, ARCO Products Co.; Mr. Mike Holmes, Chevron USA Products Co.; Ms. Diane Wittenberg, Southern California Edison.

CleanFleet Video Presentation.

Fleet Operations: Mr. David E. Becker, Federal Express.

U.S. Alternative Fuels Policy: The Honorable Bill Alexander, U.S. House of Representatives.

Closing Remarks: Chairman Henry Wedaa. Adjourn to news conference outside in the ballroom circle.

Federal Express has volunteered its fleet of delivery vehicles to demonstrate clean fuel options while operating its trucks under real-life conditions.

Mr. Speaker, every American should thank Federal Express for its vision and leadership for testing modern technology that complements the environment while vigorously competing in the global marketplace.

#### DENTIST OVERREGULATION

(Mr. PORTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight another unreasonable Federal regulation.

OSHA recently published regulations to protect health care workers from disease. But these regulations ignore what should be obvious to everyone; a clinic is different from a hospital is different from a dental office.

Yet, OSHA prescribed similar procedures for all health care operations.

Never mind that dentists already follow guidelines issued by another Government agency—the Centers for Disease Control. OSHA developed a new standard for hospitals and then simply applied it to dentists.

An example of the ridiculous results: Under the existing CDC guidelines, dentists wash their gowns at home. But the new OSHA regulation requires a dentist to install a commercial laundry in his office. At the end of the day, the dentist must deposit the gown he or she has been wearing in a hamper, then put on a new gown to carry the first gown to the washing machine.

While these regulations make sense for an inner city hospital with hundreds of workers, this is the type of unwarranted imposition on dentists that these new OSHA regulations prescribe.

Mr. Speaker, we need to inject some sense into our regulatory process. We can start by reigning in OSHA.

□ 1250

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEACTIVATION

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, just as a Member of the majority, as the gentleman is, would be disturbed if some Member of the minority was attempting to take

him off his feet when he attempted to speak, we in the minority are also concerned when the majority using their power to try to take Members of the House and the minority off their feet.

We are particularly disturbed that the Speaker yesterday endorsed such efforts in a statement that he made and reported by the Congress Daily where he indicated that he was willing to take Members off their feet with regard to the legislative appropriations process.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if I am not mistaken, the gentleman supported the balanced budget amendment rule, is that correct, the rule which allowed us to bring up the balanced budget amendment?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I did.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. And the gentleman is aware that rule provided that two-thirds of the time would be provided the Republican side and that of the four amendments, three were Republican amendments; is that correct?

Mr. WALKER. Well, as I recall that rule, it was brought by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM] who is a Democrat, so it was brought to the floor by Democrats, not by Republicans.

I am not certain exactly what the point of the gentleman is, but the fact is that no one was restricted for speaking.

When the gentleman's party, and he supported this some years ago, came to the floor with the constitutional amendment on equal rights, they did it under a Suspension Calendar which did not even give any right for any amendment.

I remember the gentleman well voting for that particular bill under a Suspension Calendar, so I am not certain what the gentleman's point is.

The gentleman has consistently been one of those who has been willing to help muzzle the minority in every way possible and use the processes of the House in as political way as possible.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the nonanswer, and I will pose my question again.

The gentleman supported the rule, which he answered yes. Is the gentleman aware that the rule which he just admitted was brought to the floor by the Democrats, gave two-thirds of the time to their Republicans and gave three of the four amendments to the Republican side, and it was brought by Democrats, just as the gentleman accused the equal rights amendments as being brought by Democrats, is the

gentleman upset with that rule? Did the gentleman rail at that rule? Did the gentleman take to the floor and attempt to impede the proceedings of the House through the use of the rules, admittedly, on that rule?

If the answer is no, he did not, then why did he not?

Is it so important to the gentleman that only the things the gentleman objects to be objected to on the floor, but the things which everybody else accepts not be objected to?

Is the gentleman the only Member in this Chamber, are there not Members on his side sitting and waiting to do their 1-minute speeches who are getting them because the Democrats are not objecting?

The gentleman is making a mockery of the rules of the House and the gentleman is attempting to blame it on us.

Mr. WALKER. No, I am not making a mockery of this House.

Reclaiming my time under my reservation, I would say to the gentleman that the mockery is being made by a majority caucus that has determined that they will use their power in however irresponsible a way they want to in order to muzzle the minority.

I simply took time today to quote from Jefferson's Manual to the gentleman.

The gentleman will remember with regard to the rule on the balanced budget amendment, the reason why we had to do it that way was because the Democratic leadership would not permit a bill to the floor, did not permit the Rules Committee to bring a bill to the floor, so it came under a process where a majority of Members had to sign a discharge petition. A majority of the Members of the House, both Democrats and Republicans, approved that process.

Having done that, of course I supported the rule, because I supported the idea of a balanced budget amendment.

I am sorry the gentleman could not join us in that, because I think it is extremely important.

But having heard all the speeches on the balanced budget about all the courage that we need in the House of Representatives in order to take the appropriate steps to get to a balanced budget amendment, I am somehow puzzled then when Members want to strike spending from the bill, why we have to go to the Rules Committee to get a rule which prevents them from striking such spending. That is exactly what the Democratic leadership is about right now.

I find that to be an abomination. I regard it as a total abdication from the rules process, and there is absolutely no way that we should permit that kind of a process to continue.

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

Mr. WALKER. Oh, I understand. The gentleman does not want to hear the explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Speaker, the agreements reached with the Russian Federation during President Yeltsin's visit, with respect to dramatic reductions in the strategic nuclear arsenals clearly demonstrate a fundamental shift from a balance of terror to a mutual reversal of the nuclear arms race.

In particular, I welcome President Yeltsin's announcement that Russia will begin immediately removing the most dangerous SS-18 missiles from alert status. I am convinced that a parallel United States action with respect to our land-based ballistic missile force would be an appropriate response that would help assure support within Russia for the Yeltsin initiative. This could involve removing from alert our intercontinental ballistic missile with the greatest number warheads, the MX Peacekeeper.

In addition, I believe it is appropriate to move forward concurrently with actual dismantling of these highly MIRVed ICBM's as early as technically feasible. Recognizing differences between our nuclear force structures, accelerated concurrent actions to reduce the number of warheads deployed on SLBM's could also be appropriate.

For this reason, I will introduce a concurrent resolution urging the President to respond to President Yeltsin's initiative to deactivate SS-18 missiles by taking parallel actions with United States strategic forces, and to work with the Russian Federation to proceed with the destruction of highly MIRVed land-based missiles as a first priority.

Our Nation has a historic opportunity to promote nuclear disarmament with the new Russian Federation. In order to take advantage of this opportunity both sides must show leadership and innovation. The Yeltsin announcement is a very positive first step, and this resolution will put the Congress firmly on record in support of further steps to keep us headed down the path toward dramatic and stabilizing reductions in nuclear arsenals.

Mr. Speaker, if I just might say to the gentleman, we normally have open rules on appropriation bills. It is only when there is a concerted effort I think to undermine an important bill that is crucial to the legislative process by the minority that we have a situation where we do not have an open rule.

#### THE LEGISLATIVE PROCESS

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania and oth-



ers here have made a very important point this morning, raising the concern of the possibility of modified closed rules on various appropriation bills.

This is not just a matter of minority rights. This is a matter of protection of the taxpayers' rights.

What is it that would be so pernicious about a possible amendment on an appropriation bill?

Well, to cut the bill even more, to save taxpayer dollars. How horrible. What a horrible prospect to contemplate that Members of the minority might actually have the right to offer amendments that will cut appropriation bills below the suggestion offered by the majority. That I think is something that we do need to be concerned about, if the minority has not offered that on behalf of the taxpayers.

I remember when the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs suggested an amendment I had last year was important only to me, but a week later when the amendment passed overwhelmingly in this body, I thought, well, I was glad that I had the right to offer it. It imposed conditions on Soviet aid at the time there still was a Soviet Union under the control of the Communists, and it is a good thing I had the right to offer that amendment, even though the chairman of that important committee said that it was only important to me and not to the other Members of the body.

We get on a slippery slope, Mr. Speaker, when we decide to choose between those amendments that the Rules Committee says are serious legislative proposals on the one hand, or purely political on the other hand. As a result, I think it is important for us not to restrict these important rules.

#### A NATIONAL ECONOMIC STRATEGY FOR AMERICA—PUTTING PEOPLE FIRST

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to object, but the gentleman from Florida cut me off a moment ago before he got the answer to his question.

The fact is that under the balanced budget amendment rule that was brought to the floor, we had 9 hours of general debate time, only 3 of which were allocated to the Republican Member, pursuant to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The rule also made in order two Republican substitutes and two Democratic substitutes; so the idea that somehow the majority was treated unfairly in the balanced budget amendment is just pure nonsense and is concocted by people who obviously have not followed the process very closely.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation of objection?

Mr. WALKER. Yes, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am just curious to know, the gentleman talks about responsibility and arrogance, the sort of things the gentleman has been talking about in the same spot in this well for 10 years.

I would be curious to know whether the gentleman signed the letter by well over 100 Members on his side of the aisle pledging to sustain a veto of a bill that had not yet been written, an appropriations bill. Was the gentleman a signatory to that?

Mr. WALKER. I absolutely was.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The gentleman was?

Mr. WALKER. And I will tell the gentleman the reason why. It is because I believe the House has become a place where Jefferson's rules are not being followed, that we no longer have order, decency, and regularity, and so therefore a veto of an appropriations bill if the President determines it is in our best interests would be entirely appropriate to do.

□ 1300

And, therefore, if the President decided to do that, I was willing to sustain it.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I guess arrogance is in the eye of the beholder, and I do not intend to use the term here. I must say, I must say that those who sign letters saying, "We intend to uphold the President's veto," on legislation that has not even been written, seems to me are not acting in a very constructive way to further the business of the House.

So, when the gentleman talks about playing a constructive role and helping this place move ahead and then you are involved with a bunch of people saying, "We want to throw off the track a process on a bill that has not even been written," I wonder how constructive that is. How does one justify that sort of effort?

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman, of course, confuses the process here. The fact is the President would certainly have the option of whether or not to veto the bill once he saw the details of it. All we were attempting to do was to make the President aware that he might have some support if this bill turned out to be a bad bill.

And I would say to the gentleman that those who signed it probably signed it as a protest against what we regard as violations of order, decency, and regularity. And what I am hearing from the membership today is that they are entirely comfortable with the

throwing out of order, decency, and regularity in the House of Representatives. So if they wonder why the minority becomes disturbed at that moment, then I guess maybe they have just become a little too arrogant in their position in the House.

I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I notice that the gentleman used the word "arrogant" two or three more times in the last sentence. But in terms of order, decency, and regularity, how fair is it to Members on your side of the aisle who serve on that committee, to be running around suggesting you are going to pledge to uphold the President's veto on a bill that has not yet been written? I am just asking a question, whether you are playing a constructive role with respect to the workings of this House of Representatives? That, it seems to me, is not very constructive.

Mr. WALKER. My guess is the members on that committee who are outnumbered, of course, by your rules, probably got a little bit of negotiating strength from that because they could assure them that if they did not conform with some of the things that we wanted done, they might face a veto on the bill. They may have actually gotten a little bit of negotiating strength out of that. And, of course, that is a terrible thing. We do not want to have the minority have any power in its control because otherwise the Democrats will not be able to spend all the money they want to spend. It is a terrible thing.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his reservation? Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate, and to get back to the whole question of your right to object or reserve the right to object under the rules of the House and what are the rules of the House, I would like to make a few points.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has made frequent reference to Jefferson's rules. Certainly, one thing we ought to clarify here, especially in light of the statement made by the Member from Florida [Mr. SMITH] that you may be making a mockery of the rules, the rules that govern this body are not Jefferson's rules. We should remind ourselves and remind the American people that, as we convene every new conference, the Democrat caucus writes their proposed rules and the Republican caucus writes their proposed rules. Both sets are taken to the floor, and with the majority, the Democrats vote their rules. So if a mockery or criticism is being made of the rules of the House, it is not mockery of the work of the great ge-

nius of Thomas Jefferson but the rules of the current Democratic caucus of the House, which endows itself not only with its own rules but with the authority to enforce its rules and, indeed, the authority to waive its rules, which is generally done in the interest of Democrat participants.

Going back to the question of the gentleman's concern about this particular rule, the committee structure, of course, is an efficient and effective way to organize the work of the body. But we should rise above the belief that Members not on a committee should be disallowed from participating in the process of legislating the final work product. This is what we do with an open rule. The committee brings the bill to the floor with its recommendations to the body, and in an open body that encourages full participation by all Members with an open rule, each and every separate Member of the body would have a chance to have their input into the legislative process.

I like to remind people I was not, for example, elected to a committee; I was elected to Congress. I ought to have a fair right to participate in the chapter-and-verse construction of every bill that is passed by this Congress. I should not be frozen out of that process by a rule that says, "If you are on the committee"—or, favored by the Rules Committee—"you then can participate. If you happen not to be, you then cannot." I think the gentleman's points are well taken.

Mr. APPLEGATE. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Regular order is demanded.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman demanding regular order was not on his feet and, therefore, is not—

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I might say, I would like to point out there are some personal rules some people in this Chamber have and at least in some instances those rules deal with obstruction and grandstanding. I find that lamentable. I have watched for 10 years all this sort of thing going on.

I would like us to get together and decide what is the business of the House and get it done instead of the kind of obstructionism we have seen over the years.

Mr. WALKER. Well, I thank the gentleman for his point of view, and it is one that he often expresses because he too is one who only is concerned about what the Democrats want to do when the Democrats want to do it. There is not an ounce of bipartisanship in his

soul, and so therefore what we have is a situation where the minority is always run over by the rules that the gentleman has helped put in place.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania would rather talk about process, but I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute about jobs for the American people instead.

I am here to talk, Mr. Speaker, about a proposal that was presented yesterday by Governor Clinton, a national economic strategy for America, entitled "Putting People First."

It calls for putting America back to work by rebuilding our own infrastructure and for defense conversion. Who can object to that?

It calls for rewarding work by promoting tax fairness. Who can object to that?

It advocates lifetime learning, from early childhood to retraining workers. Who can object to that?

It also, Mr. Speaker, provides quality affordable health care for all Americans. Again, Mr. Speaker, who can object to that?

Also, investing in communities by encouraging private investment in America and opening up world markets, these are all part of the innovative proposal presented by Governor Clinton for America.

I think the American people want a debate in this House to focus on those kinds of proposals for their jobs rather than process, process, process, as preferred by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

THE COUNCIL ON COMPETITIVENESS: THE PROOF IS IN THE PUDDING

(Mr. HANCOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the proof is in the pudding. The Council on Competitiveness has taken an active role in trying to untangle the excessive redtape that ties up and in many cases strangles economic growth in this country.

Through programs such as the President's 90-day moratorium, accelerating approval of new drugs, and civil justice reform, the Council has developed a series of reforms of the current draconian system that hinders business investment.

In the area of civil litigation alone, it is estimated that our current system costs Americans \$300 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, some in Congress have charged that the Council works in secret and wins through interference

with regulations what it did not achieve in Congress.

These allegations are simply false. The Council is a Cabinet-level body. By law, the public has a full and complete opportunity to review proposed regulatory actions and to comment.

Furthermore, the administration has always announced the decisions reached by the Council.

To my colleagues who wish to discredit the Council I say: One of the reasons the Council exists is to prevent special interests from using the regulatory process to overreach and reverse legislative intent.

I think we all would like to believe that the United States could be as competitive as anyone in the world market. However, if some of my colleagues are able to defund the Council on Competitiveness, we may all have to learn to eat sushi and watch bad horror films.

WHOM DO YOU TRUST WHEN IT COMES TO GOOD SCIENCE?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object unless, of course, I am cut off under my reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] was on his feet and demanded regular order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. WALKER. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman will have to try again.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object simply to point out that the gentleman who spoke before, the gentleman from California, that indeed we are concerned about process here because the process becomes important.

In this case, the particular process that we are objecting to is a process whereby the Democrats are attempting to limit amendments coming to the



floor that would strike at the heart of the perks and privileges of the House of Representatives. The fact is that the American people are disgusted with what they see going on here and the level of perks and privileges that the institution has bound itself to.

There was going to be an attempt to strike some of those. The Democrats are now in the Rules Committee even though the appropriation bill does not need a rule, in order to strike some of those rights from the Members of the House.

□ 1310

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the concern. The concern is not over the process. It is simply the concern that the process is leading to something which is beyond the pale in the House of Representatives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] for 1 minute.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today President Bush vetoed H.R. 2507, the National Institutes of Health Reauthorization Act. The President opposed this bill because he believes that Congress has no place asking NIH to increase women's health research. Only scientists, he argues, can determine the national research agenda.

Over the past few weeks, we have heard from hundreds of scientists who know that this bill is good science. Many of these scientists were in town last week for the NIH-sponsored Conference on Women in Bio-Medical Research. More than 60 women researchers, practitioners, and lecturers sent President Bush a letter saying that we need this bill.

We need this bill, the letter says, because it increases research for breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, contraceptives, and infertility. We need this bill because it establishes the Office for Research on Women's Health on a permanent basis. Finally, we need this bill because it ensures that women and minorities will be included in clinical trials.

So I ask you, when it comes to good science, do you trust scientists in the field, or politicians in the White House? I know who I trust.

#### TAXES ON THE WEALTHY WON'T PROVIDE PROMISED RETURNS

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I thought the gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] had the right to speak whenever a Member comes to the well. I ask, "Isn't he going to get a chance to speak this time?"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has reserved the right to object and advises the gentleman that he is the gentleman who has the right to speak now.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am just inquiring of the Chair if the procedure of the House is that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] gets to speak whenever anyone else takes the well.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, "This gentleman is making the point that the majority party is attempting to take minority Members off their feet by the rules process that they are engaged in. This gentleman was attempting to take majority Members off their feet, or I was at least implying that it could be done by the minority, if that, in fact, is going to become the regular order of the House."

So, Mr. Speaker, therefore I am not interfering with Members. They are the ones that are at fault.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I just want to make sure that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] gets a chance to make a speech whenever any other Member comes to the well. I think that is his right.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I should inform the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], because he has not been on the floor this entire time, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has sought only to intercede when Democrat Members came to the well.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, Oh, I am sorry. I did not realize this was partisan. I thought it was balanced.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] for 1 minute.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last weekend, Democratic Gov. Bill Clinton offered his budget proposal for America.

This proposal calls for a tax increase on the wealthy to help reduce the defi-

cit. Unfortunately, there aren't enough wealthy Americans to make much of a dent in our budget.

A study by the nonpartisan Tax Foundation shows if we doubled taxes on people earning a million dollars a year or more we would collect an additional \$39.5 billion. That would be enough money to run the Federal Government for almost 13 days.

If we double the taxes on families that earn \$200,000 or more, we would raise \$103 billion. That would be enough to run the Federal Government for only 33 days.

And if we doubled taxes on families earning \$100,000 or more, we would raise \$160 billion—that's not enough to run the Federal Government for 2 months.

The fact of the matter is the Federal Government is far too big and spends far too much. Congress needs to make some serious spending cuts. And Congress needs to create more revenues by allowing businesses to succeed with less regulations and more incentives.

We cannot increase the taxes on the middle class. They are already taxed too much.

#### THE NATION MUST MOVE FORWARD IN FIGHTING HATE CRIMES

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object; simply I will point out to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] who spoke earlier about partisanship that the Speaker yesterday made a statement saying that they were going to limit the amendments based upon whether they were political rather than serious legislative proposals. The fact is that where they are going to make that judgment is in a committee that the Democrats have stacked 9 to 4 partisanly in their favor. One has to guess, therefore, that an amendment like the one we had the other night that was aimed at the Secretary of Energy would be regarded as a serious legislative proposal versus one that Republicans might offer on the floor to strike money out of, let us say, some legislation of service organization that helps Democrats and would be regarded as purely political.

That is what we have a little bit of concern about, and so this is a political process. This gentleman from Pennsylvania was simply attempting to show Members of the majority that under the rules of the House we can, in fact, take them off their feet if they decide to take us off our feet, and it seems as though the process is moving

toward a time when Republicans will have absolutely no rights left in the House of Representatives.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, no one should read yesterday's Supreme Court ruling striking down one particular form of antibias law as a sign that we will not fight back against the rising tide of hate crimes which are threatening the very fabric of our society.

Make no mistake about it. Yesterday's decision dealt with a very specific type of antibias law, and it continues to allow important legislation to curb the surge of hate-based crimes which jeopardizes public safety. We, in the Congress, and lawmakers at the State and local levels, should continue to act forcefully, within the confines of the Constitution, to fight back against the hatred that is taking a serious toll in our Nation.

We must lead this Nation. We must bring the people of this diverse Nation together to build a better future. It can only happen if we stand up against hatred. Yesterday's decision should not stop us from doing so.

#### EQUAL ATHLETIC OPPORTUNITY—THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF TITLE IX, EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1972

(Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 20th anniversary of the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX prohibits sex discrimination in educational institutions that receive Federal funds. In brief, title IX states:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Opportunities for females in high school and college sports multiplied significantly during the years after title IX was passed. In 1971, there were roughly 294,000 young women participating in high school sports. By the 1972-83 school year, just after passage of title IX, that number had more than doubled, to over 800,000. And by the 1990-91 school year, approximately 1.9 million female athletes participated in high school sports.

Similar gains occurred in intercollegiate sports, where athletic scholarships for women were almost nonexistent before the passage of title IX. Now, there are over 10,000 scholarships available for women athletes.

To be sure, since the enactment of title IX, women have made substantial progress. But, given the virtual exclusion of women from athletic opportunities prior to 1972, almost any improvement would be substantial.

Two decades after the creation of title IX, we know that while things have improved, women are still not receiving equal treatment in athletics. The recent release of the NCAA gender-equity survey provides hard data to substantiate what anecdotally we have heard for many years—despite title IX, at the intercollegiate level, women still do not receive equal participation opportunities, scholarship opportunities, and operating support for their athletic programs.

On this special anniversary, our colleges and high schools should renew their commitment to title IX and our Government should increase its enforcement of title IX so that full equal athletic opportunity can be realized.

#### LOCAL COMMUNITIES AND STATES NEED CONTROL OVER TOXIC WASTE TRAVELING THEIR HIGHWAYS AND BYWAYS

(Mr. APPELATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPELATE. Mr. Speaker, today the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, otherwise known as RCRA, is being considered in the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a markup. One very important provision in that is that they will give States or local communities the right to be able to control the inflow of solid waste.

Now the Constitution prohibits States from controlling this because of the interstate commerce clause. But I think what they are doing is shortsighted because they should be adding hazardous and toxic waste, and I think that people in this country would be frightened to death if they knew what was going through their communities.

Mr. Speaker, there are 500,000 shipments each and every day of hazardous and toxic waste traveling the highways and byways, and it is dangerous to the communities, and local communities have a right to know, and they have a right to determine if they want it in their communities.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Committee on Rules will allow an amendment to be offered up to be able to add this prohibit to it, or at least for allowing the States to be able to control it, and I ask my colleagues for their help by saying, "American communities need your help."

□ 1320

#### THE URBAN ENTREPRENEURIAL ACT

(Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Urban Entrepreneurial Act. It is a bill that I believe has the potential to dramatically augment enterprise zones. I share this introduction with 52 original sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, the Urban Entrepreneurial Act would encourage Fortune 500 type companies to participate in the rebuilding of our cities. The bill will allow large companies to contribute to the success of enterprise zones without having a facility and an enterprise zone area. The UEO act will allow large companies to establish a wholly owned subsidiary which will invest capital and offer administrative assistance to qualified aspiring entrepreneurs located in an urban enterprise zone or entrepreneurs willing to locate a business in an urban enterprise zone.

Large companies benefit from this program in three ways: First, the money given to the subsidiary is treated as a regular business expense for tax purposes; second, any interest received on investments made in small businesses may be used by the large company; and, third, the large company may use employees of the entrepreneurial business to be in compliance with Federal laws.

#### SUPREME COURT IGNORING RIGHTS OF CITIZENS

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was surprised when I saw on my television last night the Supreme Court ruling on hate crimes. In 1863, this country emancipated the slaves, and shortly thereafter hate crimes against them grew at unprecedented numbers. Poll taxes were imposed to keep them from voting, schools were segregated so they could not get an education, employment opportunities were denied them, and every thread of the democratic fabric was denied to them.

It was not until the year 1954 when the Board of Education versus Topeka decision was rendered by the Supreme Court—that separate is not equal—that their right to have equal educational opportunities were given back to them. Later, we had the civil rights laws in the 1960's and the fair housing laws and others to bring about a modicum of freedom and fairness and honesty and democracy to African-Americans.

During the past 12 years, however, it seems to me that the Supreme Court itself, the highest court in this Nation, has ruled to overturn these very laws and the good that this country has had as a result of those decisions in 1954 and the 1960's.

I think it is a national shame that the highest court in this land has ig-



nored the rights of these citizens to live in happiness, to have life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and has rendered its latest decision sanctioning hate crimes under the guise of protecting the first amendment.

#### SUSPEND MOST FAVORED NATION FROM SERBIA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, in what was formerly known as Yugoslavia, a war has been going on for almost a year; 20 or 30 people are killed every day. I believe more people have been killed in Yugoslavia, Croatia, Bosnia, and Hercegovina than in Kuwait.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Congress to take action. I have a resolution that would suspend most favored nation from Serbia. But I would also ask the administration to do something and not allow innocent men, women, and children to be killed. It should be done on a multicountry basis, but for a slaughter to be taking place whereby they go in and find Croats and shoot them, find Muslims and shoot them, find Serbians and shoot them, it is absolutely crazy.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Congress will pass my resolution to withdraw the most-favored-nation status, and I urge the President and Secretary of State to take some action to put together an effort involving Europe to stop what is going on in that country.

#### AN AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5427 TO REDUCE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OVERHEAD BY 10 PERCENT

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I expect to offer an amendment tomorrow to cut 10 percent out of legislative overhead costs such as travel, supplies, and other materials.

These are commonsense cuts.

The Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee has cut Members' official expenses and franking accounts by 19 percent.

My amendment would require the rest of the legislative branch to do what the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee already has asked the House to do.

We can save millions of dollars by cutting overhead without touching one Federal program or a single Federal job.

The House should demonstrate that it has the will to act to reduce its costs, and set an example for others.

#### INTRODUCTION OF MARINE NAVIGATION TECHNOLOGY AND RESEARCH ACT

(Mr. ROHRABACHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROBERT TORRICELLI of New Jersey and I today are introducing the Maritime Navigation Technology and Research Act.

The global positioning satellite system [GPS] is a navigation system designed for military use. It can now be put to civilian use to, among other things, make vessel traffic safer, and to prevent accidents. Mr. TORRICELLI's and my bill mandates larger ships be equipped with GPS receivers, with their pinpoint accuracy—leading to the establishment of a vessel traffic control system similar to air traffic control systems.

Last Friday, President Bush, in a speech given in Orange County, stressed the value of using the technologies developed for the cold war in order to win the world economic competition in the years ahead.

The Torricelli-Rohrabacher bill will help America protect the environment, save tax dollars, and make our waterways and ports safer and more efficient.

I ask my colleagues to join Chairman GEORGE BROWN, ranking Republican BOB WALKER, Chairman VALENTINE, and ranking Republican TOM LEWIS in supporting this forward looking endeavor.

#### SLAUGHTER AROUND SARAJEVO MUST STOP

(Mr. DORNAN of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, I hope that it is not that this is a political election year that we are doing little to end the slaughter in the state of Bosnia-Hercegovina, a former province of what used to be Yugoslavia. I have talked extensively to Members on both sides of the aisle, of every political shading and ideology, and the administration should know very clearly that there is not a soul here in this body who would take a cheap political shot at our State Department, our Defense Department, or at our Commander in Chief, the President of the United States, if he decides to surgically apply lethal force to take out these insane gunners in the hills around Sarajevo that are slaughtering women and children in the city and are now deliberately enforcing an evil plan to starve to death 300,000 people. Hardly any of the people left in Sarajevo are bearing arms. The young male fighters are all on the outskirts defending the city or are trying to climb those hills to take out the mad dog gunners.

Mr. Speaker, there must be something this Congress can do to encourage the President to rescue this dying city. Last week an extremely articulate lady from the Carnegie Institute of Peace argued before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that it is time to use lethal action. Mr. Speaker, we have a consensus if not almost unanimity across this country to take aggressive action of some kind.

Please, Mr. Speaker, please chart a course for this legislative body to follow to encourage the President to do whatever it takes to end this World War II style, ghastly, ugly, evil nightmarish slaughter of old men, women, and children in Bosnia-Hercegovina. And of course, the killing of the young, the young must always die in great numbers before civilization works its will.

#### STANDING UP FOR THE RIGHTS OF THE MINORITY PARTY

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I have not been present on the floor for all of the machinations that have gone on, but I want to take this time to applaud the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] for standing up for the rights of the minority around here and making a very good point.

I remember my long service on the Committee on Appropriations and my affection for all those that serve on it. I remember the old days when, with pride, we used to bring a bill before this floor, no matter what, all 13 of them, under an open rule, all of us who served on the committee feeling that we knew our subject well enough that we could stand up against all our peers and make our case. If it failed, well, it failed. That was the House working its will. Admittedly, I have had my little to-do from time to time on the legislative appropriations bill.

I remember at one time elevator operators were one of those things we were rankled with, because we said we did not really need them. You remember our late friend Mr. Conte, and he had a thing about too many policemen falling over themselves from time to time around here.

But you can keep that, quite frankly, to a minimum. My view is that you all know my respect for this institution, and I, from my point of view, would not like to see it get out of hand when we come to tending to our own business.

It can be a field day. But I think there has been an overreaction on the majority's side. I just checked and found out there were 30 requests for amendments. About 15 of them maybe were of some area of legitimacy with respect to reducing spending.

Do you mean to tell me we cannot stand up here for what is right for 15

paltry amendments to a legislative appropriations bill?

□ 1330

I submit we could. And I would be in the forefront of doing just that when I thought our position was good and sound.

We could have been over that in 3 hours, in an afternoon. It would not have had to drag on. There is just no reason to overreact when someone says, "Hey, we ought to have an amendment or two, or three, or four."

Then, quite frankly, if they are unreasonable and irresponsible, some of us will have to simply take this well and say, "We think you are wrong," and stand up for the institution, when we think it ought to be stood up for.

I have a view that when we bring that legislative appropriations bill, there are a few places where I would like to make a few nicks. But if they are irresponsible kinds of things, I will be up here making the point that I think that is too deep and make the point.

So I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made a point here, and I would like to think that maybe it would be listened to on the other side of the aisle.

#### WAIVING CERTAIN POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 5428, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 498 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 498

*Resolved*, That during consideration of the bill (H.R. 5428) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, all points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 498 is the rule waiving points of order against provisions of the bill, H.R. 5428, the military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1993. Since general appropriations bill are privileged under the Rules of the House, the rule does not provide for any special guidelines for the consider-

ation of the bill. Provisions related to time for general debate are not included in the rule. Customarily, Mr. Speaker, general debate time is limited by a unanimous consent request by the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee prior to the consideration of the bill.

The rule waives clause 2 of rule XXI against all provisions of H.R. 5428. Clause 2 of rule XXI prohibits unauthorized appropriations and legislative provisions in general appropriations bills. The waiver is necessary because the authorizing legislation for this bill is not in place.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5428 appropriates approximately \$8.56 billion for fiscal year 1993 military construction and family housing for the various branches of the Department of Defense. It is consistent with the budget resolution.

The bill appropriates approximately \$12.2 million in funding for three projects at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is partially located in my congressional district. I am pleased that the committee approved the necessary projects. The first project is a \$5.8 million hazardous materials storage facility for the safe storage and processing of hazardous materials used by base tenants. The second is a \$5.5 million project to replace 45 underground fuel storage tanks with 33 new underground tanks and 12 tanks above ground. These projects replace old facilities and tanks which pose an unacceptable risk to people who work on the base and live near it.

The third project is \$870,000 for a facility to train firefighters to put out aircraft fires. This is matter of upgrading to meet current environmental regulations and to assure safety.

Mr. Speaker, these projects are important to Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, and to the community of Dayton, OH, which has been a world leader in aviation since the days of the Wright brothers. I commend my colleagues for including them in H.R. 5428.

Mr. Speaker, under the normal rules of the House, any amendment which does not violate any House rules could be offered to H.R. 5428. The rule received unanimous support in the House Rules Committee, and I urge my colleagues to adopt it.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] has fully explained the provisions of this rule. The waivers are necessary because the authorization bill has not worked its way through the legislative process. I would also like to reiterate that under the normal rules of the House, amendment which do not violate any House rules can be offered to the bill under the proposed rule.

I applaud the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Military Construction Appropriations Sub-

committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] for their hard work in putting this legislation together. They have done an outstanding job in balancing the changes of our armed services and in providing for the facilities and family housing needs of our service members and their families.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this bill is noncontroversial. It appropriates \$8.56 billion for military construction, military base closure, and family housing. This amount is \$287 million more than requested by the President and \$3 million less than we appropriated last year.

Mr. Speaker, under this rule changes to the bill can be made, if necessary. I support it and urge its passage so that the House can get down to business and complete its action promptly.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

This is an interesting rule because under this rule the only thing deemed waived, as I understand it, are points of order. This is not a rule where any Member is going to be prevented from offering any amendment that they deem appropriate. So for all intents and purposes, it is an open rule, other than the waiver for certain points of each.

Now, that is particularly interesting here because the only amendment, I think, we know about on this rule happens to come from a group of Democrats. There are some Democrats who want to offer a 1-percent across-the-board cut. So, of course, we have an amendment that gives them the opportunity to offer anything they doggone well please when they come to the floor today.

As a matter of fact, if there are others who want to go after the military construction, they will be free and able to come out here and do anything they want with this bill.

Now, contrast that with the bill that may come tomorrow where there are a group of Republicans that might want to offer amendments and, in particular, might even want to offer an across-the-board cut on what? The legislative appropriations bill, the bloated legislative appropriations bill that funds 20,000 staffers, funds all kinds of perks and privileges for the Congress. And Members might want to offer amendments to that. Can that take place? Can we offer Members an opportunity to come out and offer spending cuts to that? Heavens no.

Up in the Committee on Rules they are going through all kinds of machinations in the Committee on Rules to make certain that we cannot do that.

Then there is another bill that is coming along, the foreign operation



bill. That is the one that has all the foreign aid money in it.

There may be some Members that want to offer cuts on foreign aid programs, not exactly the most popular programs with the American people. And what is the Committee on Rules looking to do on that? They are looking to limit amendments so that Members cannot come to the floor and offer any cuts in foreign aid.

So when it comes to legislative appropriations, when it comes to foreign aid appropriations, we cannot offer the amendments. When it comes to military construction—and only Democrats seem interested in offering the amendment to cut—why, of course, we have an open rule out on the floor that is going to allow anybody to make the cuts they want.

That is the problem in this place. We have the perfect definition of what is happening here. Whenever they think they have something that goes after the administration, like the other night, we had the energy bill on the floor.

□ 1340

Who came parading out but a group of Democrats who were going to cut money for the Secretary of Energy's Office. It got a big vote. It was passed on a voice vote. And guess what, they pressed it to a record vote, just to get the politics real, real good, get it defined excellently out here on the floor. Under an open rule process, they cut the Secretary of Energy. But imagine, imagine if somebody wanted to offer an amendment in the legislative appropriations that might cut out something from the Speaker's office. Oh, "that would be political. That would be awful. We cannot have that happen. That would be just an abomination. So I will tell you what we will do, we will go up to the Committee on Rules and make certain that that never happens."

What kind of a game is this? No wonder the American people are disgusted. Jefferson's manual makes it quite clear. Jefferson's manual says that the House is supposed to be operated, and let me quote directly from Jefferson's manual, it is supposed to be operated, and I quote, "in decency, orderly, and with regularity."

There is no decency here any more. Decency is only reserved for the majority party. There is no order. The Democrats do whatever they want whenever they want. There is no regularity. We change the rules from bill to bill to make certain the Democrats get to offer their amendments and Republicans are denied their right to offer their amendments. It is disgusting. It is absolutely appalling.

The American people have every right to believe this place has gone overboard, that we simply have no right to call ourselves legislators any

more. This is not a democratic body with a small "d." We have lost all pretense of that. This is a legislative dictatorship where we dictate from day to day what the process will be, and it always happens to be at the expense of the minority. We ought to turn down this rule just on principle's sake.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH].

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say I think that this rule should pass, because it is an open rule, because it does allow Representatives to actually represent their constituents. They are actually allowed to come to the floor and decide whether or not there is a place they want to cut spending or a place where they think there should be more spending.

I was very distressed to read that the Democratic Speaker had indicated that he thought there would be some closed rules in appropriations bills. Let me explain why. Two weeks ago we had a constitutional amendment on the floor to require a balanced budget. We were told then by the Democratic leadership that we should not pass a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget because we needed courage now. We needed to do the right things now.

Now, 2 weeks later, we are being told by the Democratic leadership after it opposed the constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget that we are not going to allow amendments to cut spending now. So the principle seems to be we should be against a constitutional amendment to require a balanced budget because that will take place in the future, and we should not allow any amendments to cut spending because that would take place in the present, so it would seem that the No. 1 goal of the Democratic leadership is to ensure that they protect spending under any circumstance at any time.

I think every individual Democratic Member who is not absolutely committed to a big spending, big deficit, high tax program has an interest in convincing the Speaker and convincing the Committee on Rules not to send out a closed rule.

I think on our side we will be unanimous in opposing a closed rule on any appropriations bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] spoke a while ago and made clear from his own experience in the Committee on Appropriations that Members on both sides, Democrats and Republicans, should have the right to cut spending.

If we are now going to be given just a legislative dictatorship of one vote on billions of dollars with no opportunity to offer amendments, no opportunity to cut spending, I think that it makes a travesty of the House and a travesty of the process of representative government. For the life of me, I

do not see how any liberal Democrat who voted against the balanced budget amendment on the grounds that they were going to show courage now could possibly vote for a rule which blocks the right of individual Members to offer an amendment.

I do not care whether the Member is on the right or left, whether they are a Democrat or a Republican, individual Members ought to have the right to offer amendments to cut spending or increase spending as they see fit on appropriation bills, and to start to strangle that right of individual Members I think would be a very, very grave mistake.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 269, nays 143, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 210]

YEAS—269

Abercrombie	Callahan	Downey
Ackerman	Campbell (CO)	Durbin
Anderson	Cardin	Dwyer
Andrews (ME)	Carper	Early
Andrews (NJ)	Carr	Eckart
Andrews (TX)	Chapman	Edwards (CA)
Annuizio	Clay	Edwards (TX)
Anthony	Clement	Engel
Applegate	Clinger	English
Aspin	Coleman (TX)	Erdreich
Atkins	Collins (IL)	Espy
AuCoin	Collins (MI)	Evans
Bacchus	Combest	Fascell
Barnard	Condit	Fazio
Bateman	Conyers	Feighan
Bellenson	Cooper	Fish
Bennett	Costello	Flake
Bereuter	Cox (IL)	Foglietta
Berman	Coyne	Ford (MI)
Beverly	Cramer	Frank (MA)
Bilbray	Darden	Frost
Blackwell	de la Garza	Gaydos
Borski	DeFazio	Gedjenson
Boucher	DeLauro	Gephardt
Boxer	DeLay	Geren
Brewster	Dellums	Gibbons
Brooks	Derrick	Glickman
Browder	Dicks	Gonzalez
Brown	Dingell	Goodling
Bruce	Dixon	Gordon
Bryant	Donnelly	Guarini
Bustamante	Dooley	Hall (OH)
Byron	Dorgan (ND)	Hall (TX)





Roberts	Smith (OR)	Wylie
Roth	Stearns	Young (FL)
Schaefer	Stump	
Sensenbrenner	Taylor (NC)	

## NOT VOTING—19

Alexander	Hefner	Ravenel
Bonior	Jones (GA)	Ridge
Dornan (CA)	Levine (CA)	Stallings
Dwyer	Marlenee	Traxler
Edwards (OK)	McNulty	Waters
Flake	Payne (NJ)	
Ford (TN)	Perkins	

## □ 1425

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter, on the bill, H.R. 5428.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5428) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes; and pending that motion Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to not to exceed 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] and myself.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

The motion was agreed to.

## □ 1426

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5428, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the bill was considered as having been read the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] will be recognized for 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, acting on behalf of Chairman BILL HEFNER, it is my pleasure to present to you H.R. 5428, the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriations bill. BILL HEFNER is recuperating from heart by-pass surgery and is expected to be back with us in a short time. BILL HEFNER did a great job in putting this bill together before entering surgery and deserves much credit for the many important features in this bill.

The bill we are recommending totals \$8.6 billion which is right at the section 602 allocation for budget authority and \$126 million under in outlays. The bill is under last year's appropriation level and under the so-called hard-freeze level. It is also under the recommended authorization level that passed this House several weeks ago.

There is a comparison table on page 2 of the committee report which summarizes how the bill compares with last year's appropriation level. In percentage terms:

Military construction for the active components is down 41 percent from last year;

Military construction for the Reserve components is down 30 percent from last year;

NATO infrastructure is down 46 percent from last year; and

Family housing is up 10 percent as requested by the President. Members need to understand that for family housing, 77 percent of the family housing account is for operation and maintenance of existing units which total more than 400,000 units. If we didn't have these units, we would be paying about \$3 billion in housing allowances to our servicemen and women. So housing has a payback in other parts of the Defense budget.

Lastly, the base closure recommendation represents a significant increase which is up by 168 percent in order to meet target dates for realignment and closure.

Let me just go over some of the special features of the bill.

If you are proenvironment, the bill contains a total of \$800 million for environmental cleanup at closed bases and for environmental compliance projects at active bases.

If you are for cutting costs overseas, this bill reduces overseas spending by \$185 million below the budget request.

If you support the Guard and Reserve, this bill restores some of the drastic cuts recommended by the President but still remains under last year's level by 30 percent.

If you are for economic payback, this bill provides for projects that offset costs in other parts of the Defense budget.

If you are for closing bases, this bill keeps the base closure process on track.

If you are for jobs, this bill is a job producer.

Before I conclude my remarks, I want to express my appreciation to all the members of the subcommittee and especially to our ranking minority member, BILL LOWERY, who will be leaving this Congress later this year. BILL LOWERY, along with BILL HEFNER, has helped produce many responsible military construction spending bills over the years and I am sure this body is going to miss him.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks and I reserve the balance of my time.

## FY 1993 Military Construction Appropriations Bill (H.R. 5428)

	FY 1992 Enacted	FY 1993 Estimate	Bill	Bill compared with Enacted	Bill compared with Estimate
Military construction, Army .....	880,820,000	409,750,000	534,520,000	-346,300,000	+124,770,000
Rescission .....	-39,000,000			+39,000,000	
Total, Military construction, Army (net) .....	841,820,000	409,750,000	534,520,000	-307,300,000	+124,770,000
Military construction, Navy .....	683,859,000	287,592,000	396,059,000	-487,800,000	+108,467,000
Rescission .....	-56,392,000			+56,392,000	
Total, Military construction, Navy (net) .....	827,467,000	287,592,000	396,059,000	-431,408,000	+108,467,000
Military construction, Air Force .....	1,005,954,000	672,450,000	698,599,000	-307,355,000	+26,149,000
Rescission .....	-94,400,000			+94,400,000	
Total, Military construction, Air Force (net) .....	911,554,000	672,450,000	698,599,000	-212,955,000	+26,149,000
Military construction, Defense agencies .....	724,740,000	311,526,000	308,176,000	-416,564,000	-3,350,000
Total, Active components .....	3,305,581,000	1,681,318,000	1,937,354,000	-1,368,227,000	+256,036,000
North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure .....	225,000,000	221,200,000	121,200,000	-103,800,000	-100,000,000
Military construction, Army National Guard .....	231,117,000	12,300,000	180,885,000	-70,452,000	+148,365,000
Military construction, Air National Guard .....	217,588,000	132,270,000	230,209,000	+12,643,000	+97,939,000
Military construction, Army Reserve .....	110,389,000	8,300,000	8,300,000	-102,089,000	
Military construction, Naval Reserve .....	59,900,000	9,900,000	9,900,000	-50,000,000	
Military construction, Air Force Reserve .....	9,700,000	24,380,000	34,330,000	+24,630,000	+9,950,000
Total, Reserve components .....	628,672,000	187,150,000	443,404,000	-185,268,000	+256,254,000
Total, Military construction:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	4,159,253,000	2,089,668,000	2,501,958,000	-1,657,295,000	+412,290,000
Appropriations .....	(4,349,045,000)	(2,089,668,000)	(2,501,958,000)	(-1,847,087,000)	(+412,290,000)
Rescissions .....	(-189,792,000)			(+189,792,000)	
Family housing, Army:					
Appropriation .....	1,557,245,000	1,556,117,000	1,572,079,000	+14,834,000	+15,962,000
Portion applied to debt reduction .....	-125,000	-127,000	-127,000	-2,000	
Total, Family housing, Army (net) .....	1,557,120,000	1,555,990,000	1,571,952,000	+14,832,000	+15,962,000
Family housing, Navy and Marine Corps .....	902,140,000	1,017,247,000	1,029,495,000	+127,355,000	+12,248,000
Family housing, Air Force .....	1,075,283,000	1,264,398,000	1,260,895,000	+185,612,000	-3,503,000
Family housing, Defense agencies .....	26,200,000	28,400,000	28,400,000	+2,200,000	
Homeowners Assistance Fund, Defense .....	84,000,000	133,000,000	133,000,000	+49,000,000	
Total, Family housing:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	3,644,743,000	3,999,035,000	4,023,742,000	+378,999,000	+24,707,000
Appropriations .....	(3,844,888,000)	(3,999,182,000)	(4,023,889,000)	(-1,379,001,000)	(+24,707,000)
Applied to debt reduction .....	(-125,000)	(-127,000)	(-127,000)	(-2,000)	
Base realignment and closure accounts:					
Part I .....	658,600,000	440,700,000	415,700,000	-242,900,000	-25,000,000
Part II .....	100,000,000	1,743,600,000	1,818,600,000	+1,518,600,000	-125,000,000
(By transfer from Environmental Restoration, Defense) .....		(89,000,000)	(89,000,000)	(+89,000,000)	
Total, Base realignment and closure accounts .....	758,600,000	2,184,300,000	2,034,300,000	+1,275,700,000	-150,000,000
Grand total:					
New budget (obligational) authority (net) .....	8,562,596,000	8,273,003,000	8,560,000,000	-2,596,000	+286,997,000
Appropriations .....	(8,752,513,000)	(8,273,130,000)	(8,580,127,000)	(-192,386,000)	(+286,997,000)
Applied to debt reduction .....	(-125,000)	(-127,000)	(-127,000)	(-2,000)	
Rescissions .....	(-189,792,000)			(+189,792,000)	
(By transfer) .....		(89,000,000)	(89,000,000)	(+89,000,000)	

□ 1430

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5428, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993.

I want to congratulate the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], and all my other Appropriations Committee colleagues on the Military Construction Subcommittee for the great job in putting this bill together. This bill provides a large measure of support to our National Guard and Reserve components. These components play a vital role in our national security.

In addition, all of the National Guard and the Reserve components have a tremendous peacetime mission, and because they are local, they play a big part in support of the regular services.

In fiscal year 1990, the Guard was called out for State emergency missions 292 times in 38 States; in fiscal year 1991, 337 times in 42 States. This need will continue.

These facts are not understood by many. Every time the Guard was called up, the local areas saw their military dollars were being spent on something important to the areas—and that feeling carries on to the whole Army.

We need to continue to provide support to the Guard and Reserve for all of these reasons.

I want to call attention to some of the programs in this bill that are of special interest to my State. For Camp McCain funding is provided for defense access roads. For the Meridian Naval Air Station child development center funding is included. At Keesler Air Force Base funding for an alteration and addition to the child care center is included as well as funding for an alteration to the student dormitory. For Key Field, at Meridian, provision has been made to alter the aviation support facility, and the squadron operations facility, and to construct a fire



station. Also, funding is provided to alter the vehicle maintenance shop at Thompson Field in Jackson.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides needed support to our Guard and Reserve, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by taking a moment to wish our chairman, BILL HEFNER, a speedy recovery and inform my colleagues that while he may not have been physically present through all of our deliberations, his hand is in this bill. And he has been ably represented by our colleague from Georgia, LINDSAY THOMAS. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his diligence and leadership.

This body has been immersed in talk of a peace dividend and how to spend the money saved on defense. We find ourselves hurled toward change as the evolving world situation and the austere fiscal environment demand cuts in defense. Few quarrel with the bulldown or downsizing of the military as they see mental pictures of missiles being pounded into plowshares. An answer to our prayers.

This subcommittee, however, doesn't deal with missiles, or tanks, B-2 bombers, submarines, or battle groups. Our esteemed chairman, BILL HEFNER, is fond of saying the programs we deal with are not sexy. They are not. The military construction subcommittee deals with quality of life issues for our men and women in uniform. We fund the facilities where our military personnel live and work. I have seen many stories on the difficulties of doing away with massive weapons systems, dismantling nuclear warheads. I have seen no reporting on the fact that 500 military personnel are leaving Europe every day with their children, dogs, cars, and furniture. Gen. John R. Galvin, supreme allied commander and commander of our forces in Europe, says they cannot find moving vans the demand is so great.

And when these service personnel and their families reach the United States to be reassigned to new duty stations, there is no housing available to them on base, and not enough salary for them to afford off-base housing. In the past 2 years General Galvin has removed 230,000 troops and dependents from Europe. He promises to be down to a level of 150,000 active duty personnel by 1995. Yet we have been able to do little to alleviate the housing shortages here in the United States.

Indeed, rather than build to accommodate those returning from duty stations abroad, we are struggling with a construction pause. My hometown of San Diego, the primary West Coast

base for the Navy and Marines, has a minimal need today for 19,000 military family housing units. Few of those will be built.

To some the pause made a great deal of sense. If we are closing bases why would we bother to build facilities? The situation is then aggravated by the fact that, when or if the pause is lifted, we still will have no money for construction because the available money is being used to close or reorganize more than 100 military bases.

This is the catch-22 of the Military Construction Subcommittee of Appropriations. But it is a nightmarish dilemma for the service men and women who are faced with living the consequences of our need to cut defense.

Now is not the time to forget that we are at peace because of the work of our Armed Forces personnel. They went where we asked them, and still follow orders without complaint. Yet few voices are raised on their behalf, few Members of Congress view them as a constituency. Cuts are endured. Many are leaving the service voluntarily. There is some thought that these cuts will help unemployment by freeing up money to rebuild our infrastructure. I might ask, how much thought has been given to 100,000 highly trained, highly motivated, clean-cut individuals leaving the military and entering that same job market each year?

But I've asked rhetorical questions for which I have no answers. And now, having presented the strictures under which we had to work and the woeful lack of funds with which we had to work, I must tell you that this subcommittee made the best of an untenable situation in putting this bill together.

This \$8.6 billion bill is at the 602(b) allocation for budget authority. It is below last year's level and below the authorized level. Military construction has been reduced from \$4.2 billion in fiscal 1992 to \$2.6 billion—even though the Army still has 100 million square feet of luxurious temporary World War II facilities as part of its inventory. The military construction funding level has not been this low since 1982. Those temporary World War II facilities, almost 50 years old, just may become permanent at this rate.

Base closure accounts are up by \$1.3 billion to \$2 billion or 168 percent over last years' \$700 million. Total cost for implementing base closure I and II will be \$8 billion. These closures are necessary and more will come. But the funds for base closure are being taken out of the funds for military construction worldwide. It adds insult to injury for military personnel and retirees, for whom base closure incites anger, fear, and uncertainty, as well as a feeling that promises have been broken.

I want to thank our chairman, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, and other members of the subcommittee

and especially the hard-working staff for the effort that went into crafting this bipartisan bill. Whatever the circumstances, in my 8 years on this committee, we have always worked together toward the goal set by our chairman—that of enhancing the quality of life of our service men and women. This is my 6th and last year as ranking member on military construction. Mr. Chairman, it has been a privilege and an honor to serve. I will remember this subcommittee and my colleagues with fondness. I will also remember those whom I have come to know aboard C-130's and in trenches in Saudi Arabia, aboard ships and at home in new quarters in San Diego, and elsewhere around the world—the finest instrument for peace the modern world has seen—our service men and women. I would not have had it any other way.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWERY of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Chairman, I rise basically to have a colloquy with our chairman today, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

Before I begin that colloquy, however, let me respond to the comments of the chairman, as well as to my ranking member, very briefly. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] is one of the very fine members of our committee, and he is not with us because he has had a minor health setback. He will be back in the House shortly, I am sure. I want to congratulate the chairman on the product of his work throughout this year. I also want to express my appreciation to our chairman today, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], for the fine work he has done with this bill. I especially, however, want to take just a moment to share with the House my deep appreciation for my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY].

Mr. Chairman, a lot of people come to the Congress. A lot of people seek political office. Relatively few come to public affairs with a very limited number of kneejerk positions. People often come here with preconceived notions about the way they are going to change the world. The gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] came to the Congress to make a difference, to affect public policy in the most positive of ways. He is a guy who is willing to listen. He is, most importantly in my mind's eye, a very fine member of the Committee on Appropriations who, above and beyond the work of his subcommittee, spends endless hours and energy attempting to help his colleagues and friends. For

that I am grateful, and I know that the House, as well as the committee, will miss the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in a colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], and, therefore, rise for the purpose of engaging in this colloquy to get a handle on the purposes for which funds appropriated for the environmental restoration at base closure sites may be used.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEWIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to engage the gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS] and to inform the House that the subcommittee staff have been working with the general counsel of the Air Force to clarify the intent of Congress with regard to the BRAC I funding contained in H.R. 5428.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Is it the chairman's understanding that there is no legal impediment to using funds appropriated in the bill now before us to compensate a commercial operator who leases property from the Air Force and has in fact complied with Air Force and EPA requirements for environmental cleanup at facilities located on a closing military base?

□ 1440

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, it is the subcommittee's intention that the funds appropriated here can be so utilized provided that the Air Force could reach an agreement on what constitutes a reasonable claim with the private party that has undertaken the risk of expediting environmental restoration. In fact, the Military Construction Subcommittee has serious concerns about the pace and priority of the Department's response to environmental restoration at closing military bases. In our report we have provided language directing the Department to expedite cleanups through a more flexible responsible approach. We would certainly want to draw positive attention to this unique situation if it represents a case study for flexible response which ultimately expedites cleanup.

Mr. LEWIS of California. I thank the gentleman for his time and appreciate the explanation.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, first of all I do want to say thank you to the entire subcommittee, and certainly to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], for all of their efforts. Having served on this sub-

committee myself for a number of years, but not this term, I should say on behalf of my constituents at Fort Bliss, TX, their efforts on behalf of their housing needs, the barracks modernization program, were most appreciated. You have sought to continue and complete it.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to thank, of course, the Committee on Armed Services for their authorization of these projects, and particularly the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], our chairwoman, as well as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Mr. Chairman, without belaboring it too much, I think it is not wrong for any of us who have served with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] on that particular subcommittee for use personally, not just for our constituents and the soldiers and sailors and men and women in the Armed Services that we represent, to say to both of these Members, thank you very much for a job certainly well done.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5428, military construction appropriations for fiscal year 1993, and to thank the distinguished chairman, BILL HEFNER, and the Subcommittee on Military Construction for their efforts on behalf of American military personnel and their families across the country and around the world. I would also like to express my appreciation for the subcommittee's work on behalf of Fort Bliss, TX.

The bill contains projects vital to the morale, recruitment, and retention of U.S. military personnel. Not only does the bill relate to new military construction projects but also contains provisions important to diverse items such as weapons systems, environmental concerns, family housing, child care centers, and educational needs of military families. It also addresses the important issues related to base closures.

Of special concern to my congressional district are barracks modernization projects at Fort Bliss contained in this bill. The Department of Defense has again omitted military construction projects at Fort Bliss as it has done over the past several years. Barracks on the post are World War II vintage and clearly substandard. As Congress debates the future defense needs of our country, these projects will enhance the quality of life, morale, and retention of a well-trained, volunteer Army. The House Armed Services Committee recognized this need and authorized these barracks projects in the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1993, and I want to thank Chairwoman SCHROEDER and Chairman ASPIN for their leadership in this issue on the authorizing committee.

I am pleased to report that improvements to family housing at Fort Bliss were contained in the Department of the Army's budget submissions for fiscal year 1993, and I appreciate the subcommittee's support for this initiative. These improvements will contribute to the quality of life for military families living in El Paso.

Fort Bliss is home of the U.S. Army Air Defense Artillery Center, and my colleagues will remember that its soldiers gained international fame during the Persian Gulf War because of its Patriot-trained units. Clearly, the air defense mission in the U.S. postwar military strategy will increase, and Fort Bliss' role will be enhanced. I, therefore, believe it is critical to go forward with a barracks modernization program at this post, and the projects contained in the bill will complement this plan.

In closing, I wish to again thank the subcommittee for its consideration of these important matters, and I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, I rise in support of this bill. First, I would like to ask everyone to pray for Chairman HEFNER's speedy recovery from his illness. With the guidance of our very able chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS] stepped in and produced a bill as good as anyone could within the budget constraints that we face.

I would also like to commend and add my kudos to the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], our ranking member, for getting this bill out. We will miss the gentleman from California in the years to come and we appreciate his service to this body. Next year we will not have the guidance of the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], he goes on to bigger and better things.

This bill, while not enough, in my judgment, supports the need of our military personnel and their families.

As many Members know, I am very interested in the quality of life of our military personnel. Over the past few years it has become abundantly clear that Congress has decided to ignore the serious housing crisis we now face at many of our military facilities around the country and around the world. I invite my colleagues to come down and look at some of the pictures of the facilities that we are having our military families live in. It would absolutely boggle your mind.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this family housing expenditure is extremely important to the morale and welfare of our fighting forces. It is critical for retention of our highly trained personnel, and it is important for the goal of the Defense Department to have at its disposal the finest, highest trained military force in the world.

Mr. Chairman, to my colleagues who may just look at the bottom line, let me say you may see in this bill an \$8.6 billion expenditure, and you say, well, that is about \$300 million of spending over the President's request. I just want my colleagues to look at the bill and realize that we are spending about



\$2 billion for base closures, about \$1.3 billion more than last year on base closures, and we earmark about \$443 million for environmental restoration at the bases being closed. If you take that \$2 billion away from this bill, providing facilities and family housing for our military personnel, it is actually a cut over last year.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that my fiscally conservative colleagues will take a hard look at this bill and understand that this is not enough. This is not enough to take care of our military families, and, therefore, Members ought to vote for the bill, because I think it is a fiscally responsible bill.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN].

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the acting chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], and the ranking Republican, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], on a very good bill. In particular, I want to wish them both well as they leave this body. They have provided distinguished service to the Nation and to the Congress. We appreciate that service.

Mr. Chairman, BILL and Katie Lowery and my wife Susan and I have shared many good times together. We have watched their children grow. I know they are anxious to watch them grow in a closer way. That is an important part of life, and we just wish them the very best in the world, as well as to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS].

This bill is so important because it does represent something that we do for our investment in the protection of peace and freedom. Even in peacetime, what we spend on defense and what we spend on our forces is our investment and our guarantee that we can live in peace and in freedom. If we are going to have a volunteer force, then we have to provide the kind of facilities that make the service of our country attractive to those men and women whom we need so badly to serve our country at times which are not as dramatic perhaps as others, to encourage them to be in the service, to stay in the service, to be career people, and to be part of our investment in peace and freedom.

Mr. Chairman, I hope my colleagues will all support the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER].

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], I want to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], and every member of this subcommittee for the work that they have done as far as this bill is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent bill. This subcommittee, like all of the subcommittees on the Committee on Appropriations, has an excellent staff.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that some 2,000 Members have served in the House and the Senate since I have been a Member. I have been here 39 years now.

Mr. Chairman the total number, and I believe this number is correct, as far as Congress is concerned, beginning with March 4, 1789, up to the present time, we have had some 11,384 Members serving in this Congress, 694 of them in both the House and the Senate, and, Mr. Chairman, none more able, none more dedicated, than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS] and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY]. We are going to miss both of these gentlemen. They both have announced their retirement. They are the right age and they ought to stay with us.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], is in the hospital recovering from an operation. He is doing fine. Like the chairman of our full committee, when the chairman of a subcommittee or the full committee needs a little help, we circle the wagons on this committee and help him.

Mr. Chairman, I want to commend all of the members of this subcommittee and their excellent staff for a good bill. Mr. Chairman, we recommend this bill to the Committee.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5428, the military construction appropriations bill, and in particular the provision funding the construction of a new child development services center at Fort Monmouth, NJ.

I would like to commend Chairman HEFNER for his work on this bill and, of course, wish him a speedy recovery from his recent heart surgery and Mr. THOMAS for his fine work on this legislation and say that we will certainly miss him as he goes into retirement. Subcommittee members crafted an \$8.6 billion bill in a tough year where funding for most construction projects was significantly reduced.

I would especially like to thank the subcommittee ranking member, Mr. LOWERY, for his help in securing the \$3.55 million necessary for Fort Monmouth to complete the construction of its child care center. I want to join my colleagues in expressing my deep respect for BILL and to let him know how much we will miss him.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, I wrote to both the chairwoman and ranking member of the Military Installations Subcommittee requesting an authorization for the Fort Monmouth military construction project. I was

very pleased that the Armed Services Committee included our authorization in the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1993 (H.R. 5006).

On two occasions, I wrote to Chairman HEFNER and the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY] to request that the funding for the Fort Monmouth child care center be included in the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriation bill. During the March 25 hearing, I personally testified before the subcommittee where I outlined the need for this child care center and updated the Members on the incomplete status of this facility. I also subsequently made a personal appeal to my good friend, Mr. DELAY of Texas, urging his support for this project when the subcommittee conducted its markup of the military construction draft. Fortunately, the subcommittee members recognized the Army's pressing need for this safe, modern and acceptably sized, child care center.

Mr. Chairman, recently I spoke with the commanding general of Fort Monmouth—General Mallette. I was very impressed with his priorities. He told me that the welfare of his personnel and their families was number one on his list of responsibilities. I applaud him for this view.

The lack of adequate child care space for the civilian employees of Fort Monmouth and the long waiting lists which more than 300 military families currently endure place an undue burden on the families of this post. The funding to complete the child care center is critical.

Mr. Chairman, the construction of the new child development services center at Fort Monmouth will accommodate 244 children in a modern, 19,600 square foot facility. All-day operation would eliminate child care waiting lists and would finally provide child care services to the civilian population of the Fort. Care can now be provided for part-day, full-day, and special needs children as well. The new facility will eliminate the need for the four current child care centers which are located in potentially unsafe facilities such as converted office space, a 1960's era training building, and a World War II-vintage wooden chapel.

Work on the Fort Monmouth child care center had already begun when the Army's construction moratorium was announced. In fact, 35 percent of the project was completed and \$222,000 had already been spent on the predesign conference, workshop meeting, early preliminary sketches, topsoil exploration and the internal review. The original construction start—fiscal year 1992—was delayed until at least fiscal year 1994. However, the Fort Monmouth community could not wait that long—or potentially longer.

With the approval of today's military construction bill, Fort Monmouth will have the necessary \$3.55 million needed

to actually complete the construction of the project.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the House to adopt this measure without delay.

□ 1450

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise simply to extend my hearty congratulations to my friend and classmate from San Diego, the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY]. He has worked over the past decade to bring forward bills from this Subcommittee on Military Construction in a very, very positive way. It has been a privilege serving with him.

I am sorry that he is going to be leaving this institution, but I wish him well and simply want to compliment him on his fine work here today.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman HEFNER.

We have a strange dichotomy in this country that we often laud the people that fight our battles and then we scale down without taking care of those people.

The gentleman from California [Mr. HEFNER], the gentleman from California [Mr. LOWERY], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], I commend them on this bill. Not only is it below last year's budget, I voted for the balanced budget amendment, but we must have priorities in this country. And one of those priorities must be that the people that risk their lives and fight and sometimes die for this country, we should take care of.

The cost of living in San Diego is very high, as it is across the country. Many of these families are separated for 6 or 7 months. Many qualify for welfare. And when we have 230,000 people coming back from Europe, we do not have the room for them. We are not cutting weapons systems. We are cutting families. And we are cutting children, that in this country military construction stands generally for taking care of families.

That is why I am in strong support of this bill. I would like to thank the gentleman from California, BILL LOWERY, and, again, the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman HEFNER, for such a good bill. I fully support it.

There are going to be those Members that want to cut this bill across the board. To them I would say that we are going to cut families and we are going to cut children to the quick. There may be some individual areas where the bill could be cut, but not to cut it

across the board. I want my colleagues to remember who they are really hurting. If we want to balance the budget, do not do it in this area.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 5428, the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriations bill. First, I would like to express my deep appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Mr. HEFNER, for whom we all wish a speedy recovery, and the ranking minority member, Mr. LOWERY, for the time and energy they each put into crafting this bipartisan bill. As a member of the subcommittee, I can attest to the pragmatic and cooperative spirit with which this legislation was prepared. In addition, the subcommittee staff is to be commended highly for the long hours they put into the subcommittee's hearings and for their work in putting this year's bill together.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5428 is under the fiscal year 1992 appropriations level by over \$200 million in outlays. It is a responsible bill that takes care of the needs of military personnel and their families. The Appropriations Committee has always given special emphasis to quality of life issues, and this bill is successful in providing essential services to our servicemen and women.

The bill also includes a total of \$134 million for environmental restoration activities at bases scheduled for closure or realignment under round 1, and another \$378 million for bases closing under round 2. Environmental cleanup is essential if we are going to enable affected communities to convert these installations to civilian use in an expeditious manner. The enormity of environmental restoration work needed at these sites is already presenting significant barriers to this process. The committee continues to be concerned about the pace of cleanup at closure sites, and we propose to address these concerns by extending the operation of the Defense Environmental Restoration Task Force, which is tasked to explore ways to expedite and streamline the process.

Mr. Chairman, I would also like to point out a number of projects in H.R. 5428 that affect bases in northern California. Specifically, the bill includes additional funding for several key projects at Beale Air Force Base in Marysville, McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento, Travis Air Force Base in Fairfield, and Mare Island Naval Shipyard in Vallejo. Each of these projects is critical for the continued successful operation of the bases.

For Beale Air Force Base, the bill funds a new fire training facility. The new facility is needed to train firefighters in handling mass fuel spills and three dimensional—running fuel—fires, and is needed to comply with Federal and State environmental standards. Additionally, the bill authorizes construction of a new security police operations center that is needed. The new facility will add nearly 15,000 square feet of space for all security operations, law enforcement, resource and personnel protection, and base security functions. Finally, Beale is also authorized to undertake utility improvements and a new fire safety system in the base hospital. This project will increase patient safety and improve efficiency of the hospital's operations.

At McClellan Air Force Base, H.R. 5428 includes two environmental projects. The first project would fund the upgrade or replacement of underground storage tanks to meet Federal and State regulatory requirements. The second project consists of improvements to the base's wastewater collection system.

One additional project for McClellan involves the construction of a modern, state-of-the-industry plating shop. This project will ensure compliance with Federal, State, and local environmental laws, eliminate the risk of line or shop closure by the California Environmental Protection Agency, reduce plating process solution wastes, improve safety, and improve operations efficiency.

Mr. Chairman, Travis AFB continues to play a pivotal role in supporting the airlift requirements of the Defense Department. As the major West Coast airlift port, it is important for Travis to maintain facilities capable of supporting the high volume of personnel traveling through the base. With this in mind, the committee has authorized two projects for Travis. The first project is an upgrade in the sanitary sewer mains. The second project funds the final phase of a six-phase dormitory renovation project that has been ongoing over the last several years. The project is needed to renovate the existing facilities which have inadequate lighting, no air conditioning, and generally poor living conditions. This project has important implications for the quality of life and morale of our troops.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriations bill provides funding for a new hazardous waste storage facility at Mare Island Naval Shipyard. This project is very important for the shipyard's ability to meet stringent environmental requirements and would replace the existing, 50-year-old warehouse used for these purposes.

These projects reinforce the important role that each of these military bases plays in our Nation's defense. We, in northern California, continue to be very supportive of our local bases and our local military personnel. We plan to continue our efforts to modernize and improve facilities on the bases to ensure efficient operations as well as a good quality of life for our servicemen and women.

In conclusion, I want to commend again Mr. THOMAS, the committee members, and the committee staff for the long hours and hard work they put into this legislation. It is reflective of what our country needs to maintain a strong base infrastructure at a price that we can afford. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the members of the Military Construction Subcommittee for providing a badly needed increase in funding for the base realignment and closure II account in the bill before us today. When we voted last year on the Base Closure Commission's recommendations, I said on the floor that our responsibility did not end with that vote, but that it was just beginning. With H.R. 5428, the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriations bill, the Congress takes a small step closer to meeting its obligations to communities facing the difficult aftermath of a base closure.

Last year, due to a mixup between the authorizers and appropriators, the BRAC II ac-



count was designated as the exclusive source of funding for environmental cleanup at closing bases in round 2. Unfortunately, there were few funds in the account. This bad situation gave the Air Force an opening to follow its poor performance during the base closure process with an encore of almost equally deficient proportions—it gave them a reason to delay funding for cleanups at bases like Loring Air Force in my district.

There can be no excuse for the Air Force's intransigence on the cleanup funding issue over the past year. Time and time again, the Air Force refused to make the best of a bad situation and find some funding to keep our projects on line. Thanks to this stonewalling, the cleanup at Loring will likely be delayed for a year, disrupting efforts at economic redevelopment in an area primed to lose thousands of jobs as a result of closure.

At least fiscal year 1993 will be different. At least sufficient funds will be available, albeit 1 year late. With passage of this bill, we move closer to living up to our responsibility and giving people in this country a reason to believe in the Congress. Let's hope it's a sign of things to come, not an aberration. The people near Loring and throughout the country are looking to us for leadership.

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise reluctantly in opposition to H.R. 5428.

While there are certainly many worthy projects in this bill, America's \$400 billion deficit and \$4 trillion national debt require us to make tough choices.

Mr. Chairman, 2 weeks ago, the House rejected four different proposals to add a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution. Opponents argued that courage on the part of Congress—not a constitutional amendment—was necessary to balance the budget.

But that courage—the courage to reduce the deficit by eliminating pork barrel spending—is missing today.

This bill includes a number of wasteful spending projects.

For example, this bill adds \$51.4 million for an unrequested replacement hospital at Fitzsimons Army Medical Center in Denver, CO—a community with an estimated excess health care capacity of 40 percent. The hospital could cost up to \$400 million to complete.

In addition, H.R. 5428 adds \$259 million for 111 projects for reserve component construction, many of which have either not been designed or are insufficiently designed for award in fiscal year 1993.

The bill also provides for \$19 million for a defense access road at Camp McCain, a small National Guard base in Mississippi. This road was not requested by the Defense Department, and it waives the statutory requirement for the Pentagon to study the road before constructing it.

These are only a few examples of wasteful government spending in this bill. Given my concerns and those concerns expressed to me by the taxpayers of Minnesota about the deficit, I cannot in good conscience vote for this bill.

It's time for Members of Congress to stop looking out for their parochial interests and start looking out for the national interest. It's time for Congress to quit playing politics as usual and get to the business of putting our

fiscal house back in order. It's time for Congress to balance the budget, because, as Senator WARREN RUDMAN said, "Time is running out."

I urge my colleagues to vote against H.R. 5428 and begin the process of deficit reduction. We owe at least that much to our children and grandchildren.

Mr. LEHMAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my strong support for the military construction appropriations bill, H.R. 5428. I commend the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, BILL HEFNER, and the ranking minority member, BILL LOWERY, for their hard work in bringing a visionary appropriations bill to this Chamber which reflects the changing needs of this Nation.

One aspect of the bill which I strongly support and which has an important role in the State of California is the National Guard and Reserve. These courageous men and women have played a vital role assisting in disaster relief, earthquakes, floods, fires, riots, et cetera, as well as defending our country when the need arises. The readiness of these units is critical for this Nation.

As a strong supporter of the National Guard, I was disturbed to learn of Secretary Cheney's decision to reduce the Guard, which disproportionately targeted California. The first line of defense for restoring order, whether it be from natural disasters or civil unrest, is the National Guard. Millions of Californians rely on the Guard, which was clearly demonstrated recently during the Los Angeles riots.

Considering the valuable service the Guard provides the State of California, I would like to extend my strong support for the National Guard projects included in H.R. 5428. One extremely valuable project included in H.R. 5428 is the Aviation Classification Repair Activity Depot [AVCRAD], which is located in Fresno, CA. The AVCRAD facility in Fresno is the only site in the western United States authorized to perform depot level maintenance on Army National Guard aircraft. The California AVCRAD supports 621 aircraft from 13 Western States: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming.

H.R. 5428 also directs the Army National Guard to start construction of the combined support maintenance shop in Stockton, CA. This project was funded in fiscal year 1992, but has not been initiated by the Army National Guard. The rehabilitation of the existing facility will greatly enhance the work conditions, which are inadequate at the present moment. Until this project is completed, employee health and safety will continue to be jeopardized by the lack of essential facilities and adequate lighting. This project remains a valid requirement.

Another aspect of H.R. 5428 which I support directs the Department of Defense to work with the Justice, Interior, and Labor Departments, and State and local governments to examine the possibility of using military facilities for juvenile boot camps.

Boot camps are alternatives to traditional prison sentences which focus on discipline, labor, counseling, and rehabilitation. We simply cannot afford to continue to build more and more prisons that do nothing to rehabilitate

prisoners. We must look to innovative methods which not only punish but provide a strict supervisory role and needed guidance.

I am committed to bringing change to the criminal justice system, with an emphasis on discipline and rehabilitation. We need to focus our efforts on the youthful offenders who, with proper judicial methods such as boot camps, can be successfully returned to society. One needs only to look at the staggering recidivism rate in California to see that simple incarceration does not work.

With the collapse of communism in the former Soviet Union, we now have a rare opportunity to retarget a portion of our military resources to resolve some of our domestic problems. The boot camp idea is certainly an idea worth exploring in light of these reversed priorities. We can no longer sit on our hands. We need to get back to basics and build on this Nation's strengths. Change is needed and this bill H.R. 5428, takes a step in the right direction.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. I rise today in support of H.R. 5428, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993.

I would like to commend Chairman BILL HEFNER and ranking member BILL LOWERY for their leadership. I hope Mr. HEFNER is feeling better and commend Mr. THOMAS for doing a fine job seeing this bill through in the chairman's absence.

I would also like to recognize the subcommittee staff for their hard work. Once again the job has been carried out in an enthusiastic, professional manner.

H.R. 5428 is a good bill. We have come in under our 602(b) allocation and yet the bill reflects our commitment to giving the men and women of the armed services the best we can afford.

Our emphasis this year is on base closure. We have increased this account by over 100 percent. Frankly, we have to spend money in order to save money. And I am pleased to note that our bill gives the Department of Defense increased flexibility in the base closure account in order to accelerate base shut-downs.

Although our bill is below our allocation it is \$500 million above the administration's request. The administration presented us with an unrealistic proposal for military construction.

Even with our emphasis on a leaner Armed Forces, there is still some basic construction that must occur. To ignore that construction is to raise our out year costs. As we are discovering in other appropriation bills, we can't afford to continue pushing off problems, it's our duty to face them now.

I would say to my colleagues who complain of unrequested projects in this bill, the budget presented us was unrealistic. Any unrequested construction in the bill has passed the review of this committee and the Armed Services Committee. What we have in here is necessary.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlemen from North Carolina and the gentleman from California for putting together an excellent bill. And I will greatly miss the leadership of Mr. LOWERY next year. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the military construction bill is the second of 13 appropriation bills to be brought before the House this year. The subcommittee has worked in a bipartisan manner to bring this bill to the floor.

The chairman, the Honorable BILL HEFNER, is on his way to a speedy recovery, and I wish him well.

He has been in full contact with the subcommittee and continues to be fully involved in the process of moving this bill. Chairman HEFNER has been able to accomplish this through the assistance of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS]; together they have done an outstanding job. They have worked hard to accommodate the concerns of the Members of this body.

Mr. Chairman, I also commend the ranking Republican member, my friend, the Honorable BILL LOWERY. Bill has worked diligently as a member of this subcommittee for 8 years and has served as the ranking Republican member the past 6 years.

He has done an outstanding job of ensuring that the needs of our servicemembers have been met during these changing times. As he is retiring, this is the last bill he will bring to the House floor, and I thank him for his efforts to always produce a fair and balanced bill.

This bill is within its 602(b) allocation for both budget authority and outlays. It contains an appropriation of \$2.5 billion for military construction and \$4 billion for family housing. Also included is a total of \$2 billion for the implementation of Base Closure I and Base Closure II. The total appropriation provided for in this bill is \$8.5 billion.

This is a good bill, which deserves your support. More than anything else it is about the men and women of our Armed Forces. When visiting military installations around the world, you will see tangible results from this bill, results that make a difference in morale and, in turn, improves the quality of our Armed Forces.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5428, the military construction appropriations bill for fiscal year 1993. This is the second of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be reported to the House.

This bill provides \$8,560 million in defense discretionary budget authority and \$9,361 million in defense discretionary outlays, which is equal to the 602(b) subdivision for budget authority, and \$126 million in outlays below the 602(b) subdivision for outlays for this subcommittee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will continue to inform the House of the impact of all spending legislation. I will provide a "Dear Colleague" letter describing how each appropriations measure compares to the 602(b) subdivision for that subcommittee.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee in the future and commend the committee for the work they have done in adhering to the limits set forth in the budget agreement and the 1993 budget resolution.

#### Factsheet

H.R. 5428, MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1993 (H. Rept. 102-580)

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Military Construction Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1993 on Thursday,

June 18, 1992. This bill is scheduled for floor action on Tuesday, June 23, or any day thereafter, subject to a rule being adopted.

#### COMPARISON TO THE 602(B) SUBDIVISION COMPARISON TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING SUBDIVISION

The bill provides \$8,560 million of discretionary budget authority and \$9,361 million of discretionary outlays. This bill is equal to the discretionary budget authority subdivision and below the discretionary outlay subdivision by \$126 million in outlays.

This bill is defense spending only and has no domestic discretionary or international spending. The table below compares the bill's spending with the equivalent breakout of the 602(b) spending defense subdivision.

#### DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY SPENDING SUBDIVISION

(In millions of dollars)

	Military construction appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 602(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/ Under(-) 602(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	8,560	9,361	8,560	9,487	0	-126
Mandatory	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	8,560	9,361	8,560	9,487	0	-126

BA=New Budget Authority  
O=Estimated Outlays

#### PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

The following are the major program highlights for the Military Construction Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1993, as reported:

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	New outlays
Military construction:		
Army	535	109
Navy	396	75
Air Force	699	120
Defense Agencies	308	26
NATO Infrastructure	121	30
Family housing:		
Army	1,572	1,052
Navy and Marine Corps	1,029	441
Air Force	1,261	711
Base realignment and closure	2,103	252

The House Appropriations Committee filed the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays on June 11, 1992. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to House committees contained in House report 102-529, the conference report to accompany H. Con. Res. 287, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1993, as adopted by the Congress on May 21, 1992.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no additional requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5428

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, for military construction functions administered by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes, namely:

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent

public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Army as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Army Corps of Engineers and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, and for construction and operation of facilities in support of the functions of the Commander in Chief, \$534,520,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$124,300,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

#### AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 2, line 11, strike "\$534,520,000" and insert "\$515,520,000".

Page 16, strike lines 15 through 18 (all of section 124 relating to defense access roads).

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I agree with my colleague from California who just spoke. We need to be very concerned about the people in the military who are suffering and will be suffering in the months to come because of some of the draconian cuts that are taking place. However, we still do have, in my opinion, some pork barrel projects that need to be dealt with, and this amendment deals with one of those.

At Camp McCain, MS, is an Army National Guard base. It is a small facility. It only takes in about 7,500 acres, and it only supports 440 troops or 2 battalions.

I understand that they use this facility for tank training, and they fire the only caliber weapons they can use. They cannot use anything in excess of .50 caliber weapons.

This bill authorizes or appropriates \$19 million for a defense access road to this base. That is \$700,000 above the amount authorized in the defense authorization bill. This project is in the military construction account, and it should be in the Reserve components military construction account instead. So it is in the wrong account.

Section 210 of title XXIII authorizes funding for defense access roads. In order to receive funding under this program, the road or roads must be needed for national security reasons.

Under the statute, the Secretary of Defense certifies that the defense access road project does indeed serve a national security purpose. Under Fed-



eral regulations, the Secretary delegates this function to the Military Traffic Management Command [MTMC].

The MTMC will meet with officials at military installations and with State and local transportation officials to determine the need for new defense access roads.

At this point, I would like to point out to my colleagues that this part is being waived. The MTMC, who is supposed to certify that this road is necessary, is not going to be involved in this process. It has been authorized and now it is being appropriated, and they do not want to have it checked out. It is not going to be checked out by the defense agency that is supposed to check out whether or not this road is really needed for national defense purposes.

I do not know why we have done that other than they want to circumvent that process.

Section 124 of the bill waives the certification requirements for the defense access road at Camp McCain. This means that once money is authorized and appropriated for this project, construction can begin regardless of whether or not his project is meritorious.

I just want to ask the sponsors of this project why did they circumvent the MTMC. We should not be funding this type of project in direct violation of the defense access roads statute. If Congress believes MTMC is unnecessarily delaying its study of this project, then maybe we should have instead in this bill a provision to require the MTMC to move forward in a more expeditious fashion. We should not be waiving the entire certification requirements and spending \$19 million on a defense access road which may not serve a national defense purpose.

I would just like to say to my colleagues that I have been talking on this floor for the last 4 years now about prioritizing spending. I certainly support the military. I am one of the biggest supporters of the military in the House because I think defense should be a No. 1 priority.

□ 1500

However, I do not believe we should be wasting money on any project in any area of government. The MTMC is the agency that is supposed to verify whether or not this access road should be built, and they are circumventing that in the report language in this bill. It should not be done.

The deficit, as I have said many times before, is going to be \$400 billion this year. We are going to have over \$300 billion in interest on the national debt. The debt has gone from \$1 trillion 10 years ago to \$4 trillion. It took us 200 years to get to \$1 trillion and 10 years to get to \$4 trillion. We are facing an economic calamity, in my opin-

ion, in this country unparalleled in American history unless we get control of our appetite for spending.

I think we need to prioritize. We need to make absolutely sure that every dollar we are spending is necessary. This access road is not undergoing the scrutiny that is necessary for this kind of a project. It is \$19 million. When we are talking about a \$4 trillion national debt and a \$1.8 trillion annual budget, \$19 million is not a lot of money, but to the average taxpayer in this country it is a lot of money.

I would just say to my colleagues this should be scrutinized very thoroughly, at least, at the very least, by the MTMC. If we are not going to do that, then I think it should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this military construction bill, but against this particular amendment. I just recently became aware of the gentleman's intent to strike this \$19 million which provides for construction of a road that is about 18½ miles that runs through parts of the district of the chairman, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and parts of my own.

Let me make a couple of points. First off, this particular road has been authorized by the Committee on Armed Services to the extent of \$18.3 million to correct this deficiency of no highway access to Camp McCain. It was authorized in H.R. 5006.

The second point is that there currently is no highway access for combat vehicles and other heavy equipment to Camp McCain. This construction will allow for over-the-road hauling of the M-1 tank and the Bradley fighting vehicles. At this point they have been carried into the environs of that camp from the interstate highway, Interstate 55, which is very damaging, of course, to that particular road, and also does tremendous damage to the infrastructure in general. So the Committee on Armed Services considered this to be a worthwhile proposal and included an MV authorization, and it was carried through the appropriations process as a necessary item for funding.

I would just like to say that this has been considered by two standing committees in this body, and I do believe that it is a valuable and a necessary resource, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ESPY. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to ask the gentleman, if it is so important, why was the MTMC [the Military Traffic Management Command] which is charged with reviewing with local officials and the Army whether or not a project is in

the national interest and should be built for national security purposes, why is it in the report language of this bill the gentleman is waiving that provision? Because they are charged with the responsibility of checking this out.

Mr. ESPY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I just have to say to the gentleman that I really cannot answer that personally. I am not on the Committee on Armed Services, nor am I on the Committee on Appropriations. Perhaps that question should be better put to one of them.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we appropriate funds for Defense access roads every year. The access road project for Camp McCain, MS, is a valid requirement which will enable the Department to move tactical equipment such as tanks and other armored vehicles, into and out of the Camp McCain training area by road.

The general provision waiving certain requirements, section 134, is identical to actions taken by Congress in prior years on other access road projects, and is recommended for the sole purpose of allowing the orderly execution of this work.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, let me give the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ESPY] a little bit more information. The Department of Defense did not ask for this access road. It was not requested by the Department of Defense.

It is going through the district of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, as has just been mentioned, as well as the gentleman who just spoke, and it smells like something to me that is going to help the infrastructure of Mississippi.

That is fine if they want to do that, but we are trying to prioritize spending right now. The military has not requested it. There are only two battalions down there, 440 National Guard people, 440. It is not utilized that much. They have been using it in the past and getting tanks in and out of there without this \$19 million access road. It has not been authorized, it has not been asked for by the military.

It was authorized and appropriated, we missed it, and it went through the authorization process. It is \$700,000 more than they did authorize.

Finally, the Military Traffic Management Command, who are supposed to scrutinize these projects, is being waived in the bill. They are waiving it. They are saying, "We did not want them to look at it. We do not want them to check with the local govern-

ment officials, the State government officials, the Department of the Army, to make sure this project is necessary."

It is \$19 million. As I said to my colleagues before, obviously, we are doing a lot of good things for each other, but we are killing the economic base of this Nation. Listen to me, fellows. We are \$4 trillion in debt. The deficit is \$400 billion this year. We have tripled the amount of tax revenues coming in in the last 8, 9 years from \$500 billion to \$1.4 trillion, and we are still \$400 billion short. Do the Members know why? It is because we do not prioritize.

This project was not asked for by the Army. It is not going to be authorized by the Army. They are not even going to let the Military Traffic Management Command charged with checking this out, check it out.

This is pure pork. It is pure pork, and we know it. I would just say to my colleagues, we have to start cutting sometime. We have to start prioritizing. Otherwise we are jeopardizing the economic well-being of America, and we are mortgaging the future of every kid in this place. This project should be stopped until it has been approved by the military, and I think that is why the gentleman put in the report language that they did not want it checked out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally in order that the House may receive a message.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The Speaker pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS) assumed the chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will receive a message.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. McCathran, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1506

#### MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1993

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further discussion on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON]?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote, and pending that, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is not present. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 2 of rule XXIII, the

Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device, if ordered, will be taken on the pending question following the quorum call. Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device.

The following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 212]

Abercrombie	Dannemeyer	Hefley
Ackerman	Darden	Henry
Alexander	Davis	Herger
Allard	de la Garza	Hertel
Allen	DeFazio	Hoagland
Anderson	DeLauro	Hobson
Andrews (ME)	DeLay	Hochbrueckner
Andrews (NJ)	Dellums	Holloway
Andrews (TX)	Derrick	Hopkins
Annuizio	Dickinson	Horn
Anthony	Dicks	Horton
Applegate	Dingell	Houghton
Archer	Dixon	Hoyer
Armey	Donnelly	Hubbard
Aspin	Dooley	Huckaby
Atkins	Doolittle	Hughes
AuCoin	Dorgan (ND)	Hunter
Bacchus	Dornan (CA)	Hutto
Baker	Downey	Hyde
Ballenger	Dreier	Inhofe
Barnard	Duncan	Ireland
Barrett	Durbin	Jacobs
Barton	Dwyer	James
Bateman	Dymally	Jefferson
Bellenson	Early	Jenkins
Bennett	Eckart	Johnson (CT)
Bentley	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (SD)
Bereuter	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (TX)
Berman	Emerson	Johnston
Bevill	Engel	Jones (NC)
Bilbray	English	Jontz
Bilirakis	Erdreich	Kanjorski
Blackwell	Espy	Kaptur
Bliley	Evans	Kasich
Boehlert	Ewing	Kennedy
Boehner	Fascell	Kennelly
Boreki	Fawell	Kildee
Boucher	Fazio	Klaczka
Brewster	Feighan	Klug
Brooks	Fields	Kolbe
Broomfield	Fish	Kopetski
Browder	Flake	Kostmayer
Brown	Foglietta	Kyl
Bruce	Ford (MI)	Lagomarsino
Bryant	Franks (CT)	Lancaster
Bunning	Frost	Lantos
Burton	Gallagher	LaRocco
Bustamante	Gallo	Laughlin
Byron	Gaydos	Leach
Callahan	Gejdenson	Lehman (CA)
Camp	Gekas	Lent
Campbell (CA)	Gephardt	Levin (MI)
Campbell (CO)	Gibbons	Lewis (CA)
Cardin	Gilchrest	Lewis (FL)
Carper	Gillmor	Lewis (GA)
Carr	Gilman	Lightfoot
Chandler	Gingrich	Lipinski
Chapman	Glickman	Livingston
Clay	Gonzalez	Lloyd
Clement	Goodling	Long
Clinger	Gordon	Lowery (CA)
Coble	Goss	Lowey (NY)
Coleman (MO)	Gradison	Luken
Coleman (TX)	Grandy	Machtley
Collins (IL)	Green	Manton
Collins (MI)	Guarini	Markey
Combest	Gunderson	Martin
Condit	Hall (OH)	Martinez
Conyers	Hall (TX)	Matsui
Cooper	Hamilton	Mavroules
Costello	Hammerschmidt	Mazoli
Coughlin	Hancock	McCandless
Cox (CA)	Hansen	McCloskey
Cox (IL)	Harris	McCollum
Coyne	Hastert	McCrery
Cramer	Hatcher	McDade
Crane	Hayes (IL)	McDermott
Cunningham	Hayes (LA)	McEwen

McGrath	Price	Solarz
McHugh	Pursell	Solomon
McMillan (NC)	Quillen	Spence
McMillen (MD)	Rahall	Spratt
Meyers	Ramstad	Staggers
Mfume	Rangel	Stark
Michel	Ravenel	Stearns
Miller (CA)	Ray	Stenholm
Miller (OH)	Reed	Stokes
Miller (WA)	Regula	Studds
Mineta	Rhodes	Stump
Mink	Richardson	Sundquist
Moakley	Rinaldo	Swett
Molinar	Ritter	Swift
Mollohan	Roberts	Synar
Montgomery	Roe	Tallon
Moody	Roemer	Tanner
Moorhead	Rogers	Tauzin
Moran	Rohrabacher	Taylor (MS)
Morella	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (NC)
Morrison	Rose	Thomas (CA)
Mrazek	Rostenkowski	Thomas (GA)
Murphy	Roth	Thomas (WY)
Murtha	Roukema	Thornton
Myers	Rowland	Torres
Nagle	Roybal	Torricelli
Natcher	Russo	Towns
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Trafiacant
Neal (NC)	Sanders	Unsoeld
Nichols	Sangmeister	Upton
Nowak	Santorum	Valentine
Nussle	Sarpallus	Vander Jagt
Oaker	Savage	Vento
Oberstar	Sawyer	Visclosky
Obey	Saxton	Volkmer
Olin	Schaefer	Vucanovich
Oliver	Scheuer	Walker
Ortiz	Schiff	Walsh
Orton	Schroeder	Washington
Owens (UT)	Schulze	Waters
Oxley	Schumer	Weber
Packard	Sensenbrenner	Weiss
Pallone	Serrano	Weldon
Panetta	Sharp	Wheat
Parker	Shaw	Whitten
Pastor	Shays	Williams
Patterson	Shuster	Wilson
Paxon	Sikorski	Wise
Payne (VA)	Siskisky	Wolf
Pease	Skaggs	Wolpe
Pelosi	Skeen	Wyden
Penny	Skelton	Wylie
Perkins	Slattery	Yates
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter	Yatron
Peterson (MN)	Smith (FL)	Young (AK)
Petri	Smith (LA)	Young (FL)
Pickett	Smith (NJ)	Zeliff
Pickle	Smith (OR)	Zimmer
Porter	Smith (TX)	
Poshard	Snowe	

□ 1530

The CHAIRMAN. Four hundred and twelve Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present, and the Committee will resume its business.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. The pending business is the demand of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] for a recorded vote. This is a 5-minute vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 276, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 213]

AYES—143

Allard	Boxer	Cox (IL)
Allen	Brewster	Crane
Andrews (ME)	Broomfield	Cunningham
Applegate	Bunning	Dannemeyer
Archer	Burton	Doolittle
Armey	Camp	Dorgan (ND)
Ballenger	Campbell (CA)	Dornan (CA)
Barrett	Carper	Dreier
Barton	Chandler	Duncan
Bilirakis	Coleman (MO)	Emerson
Bliley	Condit	English
Boehlert	Costello	Ewing
Boehner	Cox (CA)	Fawell



Fields  
Fish  
Franks (CT)  
Gallegly  
Gekas  
Gilchrest  
Glman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Goss  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Hastert  
Hefley  
Henry  
Herger  
Hobson  
Hopkins  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
James  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (TX)  
Jontz  
Kasich  
Klug  
Kyl  
Lagomarsino  
LaRocco

Leach  
Lewis (FL)  
Lipinski  
Luken  
McEwen  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Molinaro  
Moody  
Moorhead  
Morella  
Nichols  
Nussle  
Orton  
Owens (UT)  
Packard  
Paxon  
Pease  
Penny  
Petri  
Porter  
Poshard  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Riggs  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers

Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roth  
Sangmeister  
Santorum  
Schaefer  
Scheuer  
Schulze  
Sensenbrenner  
Sharp  
Shays  
Sikorski  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Stearns  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Upton  
Vento  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Weldon  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Wyllie  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

Murtha  
Myers  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nowak  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Owens (NY)  
Oxley  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Parker  
Pastor  
Patterson  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Perkins  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Pickett  
Pickle  
Price  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Ray  
Reed  
Richardson

Roe  
Rose  
Rostenkowski  
Roukema  
Rowland  
Roybal  
Russo  
Sabo  
Sanders  
Sarpalious  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Serrano  
Shaw  
Shuster  
Siskisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NJ)  
Solarz  
Spence  
Spratt  
Staggers  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds

Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Tallion  
Tanner  
Tausin  
Taylor (MS)  
Thomas (GA)  
Thornton  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traficant  
Unsoeld  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Visclosky  
Volkmmer  
Walsh  
Washington  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Whitten  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Yates  
Yatron  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—15

Bonior  
Edwards (OK)  
Ford (TN)  
Hefner  
Jones (GA)

LaFalce  
Lent  
Levine (CA)  
Marlenee  
McCurdy

McNulty  
Payne (NJ)  
Ridge  
Stallings  
Traxler

## □ 1539

Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. KASICH and Mr. HOBSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## □ 1540

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of this subcommittee, I wish to compliment the fine work of the acting chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], in the absence of the chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], who has been stricken ill in the last 2 weeks.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill to provide funding for military construction.

The bill our committee has brought to you today is a responsible bill. The total funding recommended is \$3 million below that appropriated for the current fiscal year. At the same time it continues the committee's commitment to essential national security investments.

As a committee we recognize that these investments can help encourage American men and women to continue in the military service of our Nation by providing efficient, quality workplaces, and modern housing facilities.

In addition, these investments stimulate local economies and produce jobs for many private sector workers. The multiplier effect of these payrolls is beneficial to the Nation's economy.

Two matters addressed by the committee are of special interest to me.

In providing funding for the base closure account, the committee has included \$443.5 million for environmental restoration at closed bases. This is of particular interest to those of us who represent districts in which bases are closing. Prompt and effective cleanup is crucial to achieving the fullest possible nonmilitary reuse of these facilities.

In addition, as a part of its report on this bill, the committee has directed the Air Force National Guard to implement a thorough study of potential uses for Eaker Air Force Base near Blytheville and Gosnell, AR, in the Guard stationing and training program. The Air National Guard is directed to report the results of the study to the committee by December 31.

Prior to the decision to close Eaker, the base facilities had been effectively modernized with military construction funds provided by the Congress. For the period of fiscal years 1981 through 1991, the Congress appropriated \$105,952,000 for new construction at Eaker Air Force Base.

Congresses did this at the same time that they were appropriating \$22.7 billion less than Presidents requested. In fact, in the last 23 years, Congresses have appropriated \$93.8 billion less than Presidents wanted. The bottom line is that Congress has shown fiscal responsibility while the Presidents have not. It is a continuing mystery to me that the press and the general public do not understand this simple fact.

A data table which I want to include in the RECORD today documents congressional performance in appropriating less funding than Presidents requested during these periods. Let us let the numbers do the talking.

As already noted, I believe this is a sound appropriations bill. I support it, and I urge the House to approve it.

## REGULAR ANNUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS BILLS: COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REQUESTS AND APPROPRIATIONS ENACTED

Calendar year	Appropriations budget requests	Appropriations enacted	Difference (under -) (over +)
1969	\$142,701,346,215	\$134,431,463,135	-\$8,269,883,080
1970	147,765,358,434	144,273,528,504	-3,491,829,930
1971	167,874,624,937	165,225,661,885	-2,648,963,052
1972	185,431,804,552	178,960,105,864	-6,471,698,688
1973	177,959,504,255	174,901,434,304	-3,058,069,951
1974	213,667,190,007	204,012,311,514	-9,654,878,493
1975	267,224,774,434	259,862,322,212	-7,372,452,222
1976	282,142,432,093	282,536,694,665	+394,262,572
1977	364,867,240,174	354,025,780,783	-10,841,459,391
1978	348,506,124,701	337,859,466,730	-10,646,657,971
1979	388,311,676,432	379,244,865,439	-9,066,810,993
1980	446,690,302,845	441,290,587,343	-5,399,715,502
1981	541,827,827,909	544,457,423,514	+2,629,595,632
1982	507,740,133,484	514,832,375,371	+7,092,241,887
1983	542,956,052,209	551,620,505,328	+8,664,453,119
1984	576,343,258,980	559,151,835,986	-17,191,422,994
1985	588,698,501,939	583,446,885,087	-5,251,618,852
1986	590,345,199,494	577,279,102,494	-13,066,097,000
1987	618,268,048,956	614,526,518,150	-3,741,530,806
1988	621,250,663,756	625,967,372,769	+4,716,709,013
1989	652,138,432,359	666,211,680,769	+14,073,248,410
1990	704,510,961,506	697,257,739,756	-7,253,221,750
1991	756,223,264,591	748,262,835,695	-7,960,428,896

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Anderson  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Annunzio  
Anthony  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bacchus  
Baker  
Barnard  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bennett  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Blackwell  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brooks  
Browder  
Brown  
Bruce  
Bryant  
Bustamante  
Byron  
Callahan  
Campbell (CO)  
Cardin  
Carr  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Coughlin  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Darden  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Derrick

Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Downey  
Durbin  
Dwyer  
Dymally  
Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (TX)  
Engel  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Evans  
Fascell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Frank (MA)  
Frost  
Gallo  
Gaydos  
Gelderson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gillmor  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Green  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hammerschmidt  
Harris  
Hatcher  
Hayes (IL)  
Hayes (LA)  
Hertel  
Hoagland  
Hochbrueckner  
Holloway  
Horn  
Horton  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hutto

Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnston  
Jones (NC)  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Kolbe  
Kolter  
Kopetski  
Kostmayer  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
Laughlin  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Levin (MI)  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowey (NY)  
Machley  
Manton  
Markey  
Martin  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazzoli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McDade  
McDermott  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McMillan (NC)  
McMillen (MD)  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moran  
Morrison  
Mrazek  
Murphy

## NOES—276

REGULAR ANNUAL, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS BILLS: COMPARISON OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET REQUESTS AND APPROPRIATIONS ENACTED—Continued

Calendar year	Appropriations budget requests	Appropriations enacted	Difference (under -) (over +)
Total .....	9,806,444,726,262	9,739,628,493,324	-93,816,228,858

Data source: Committee on Appropriations, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER], and the members of the subcommittee for providing \$3.55 million for construction of the new childcare facility at Fort Monmouth, NJ, which is an Army installation in my district.

Mr. Chairman, the need for the childcare center at Fort Monmouth is pressing. As of December 1991, there were 341 children on the waiting list for child care. This waiting list reflects only a portion of the true need for child care at Fort Monmouth, because the existing facility does not service civilian personnel, due to lack of space. Affordable private sector child care is very difficult to find in the Fort Monmouth area.

The proposed facility would provide preschool, infant, special needs, hourly and latch-key child care. It would meet all fire and life safety requirements. The facility would be centrally located adjacent to 90 percent of all Fort Monmouth's military families, whereas existing child care is spread throughout five separate buildings.

As you know, the availability of child care goes beyond being a mere quality-of-life issue. Our military effectiveness requires that military personnel be free from anxiety, and assured that their children are in a safe and healthful environment.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely happy that support for this project has come this far, and I will continue to work on its behalf until its final approval by the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVY

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, naval installations, facilities, and real property for the Navy as currently authorized by law, including personnel in the Naval Facilities Engineering Command and other personal services necessary for the purposes of this appropriation, \$396,059,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$79,292,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent

public works, military installations, facilities, and real property for the Air Force as currently authorized by law, \$698,599,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That of this amount, not to exceed \$100,000,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, DEFENSE AGENCIES (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, installations, facilities, and real property for activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments), as currently authorized by law, \$308,176,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997: *Provided*, That such amounts of this appropriation as may be determined by the Secretary of Defense may be transferred to such appropriations of the Department of Defense available for military construction as he may designate, to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation or fund to which transferred: *Provided further*, That of the amount appropriated, not to exceed \$85,818,000 shall be available for study, planning, design, architect and engineer services, as authorized by law, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that additional obligations are necessary for such purposes and notifies the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of his determination and the reasons therefor.

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION INFRASTRUCTURE

For the United States share of the cost of North Atlantic Treaty Organization Infrastructure programs for the acquisition and construction of military facilities and installations (including international military headquarters) and for related expenses for the collective defense of the North Atlantic Treaty Area as authorized in military construction Acts and section 2806 of title 10, United States Code, \$121,200,000, to remain available until expended.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$160,665,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR NATIONAL GUARD

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air National Guard, and contributions therefor, as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$230,209,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, ARMY RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Army Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$3,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, NAVAL RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the reserve components of the Navy and Marine Corps as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$9,900,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE RESERVE

For construction, acquisition, expansion, rehabilitation, and conversion of facilities for the training and administration of the Air Force Reserve as authorized by chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, and military construction authorization Acts, \$34,330,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997.

FAMILY HOUSING, ARMY

For expenses of family housing for the Army for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$208,382,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$1,363,697,000; in all \$1,572,079,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

For expenses of family housing for the Navy and Marine Corps for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$339,640,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$689,855,000; in all \$1,029,495,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, AIR FORCE

For expenses of family housing for the Air Force for construction, including acquisition, replacement, addition, expansion, extension and alteration and for operation and maintenance, including debt payment, leasing, minor construction, principal and interest charges, and insurance premiums, as authorized by law, as follows: for Construction, \$332,954,000, to remain available until September 30, 1997; for Operation and maintenance, and for debt payment, \$927,941,000; in all \$1,260,895,000.

FAMILY HOUSING, DEFENSE AGENCIES

For expenses of family housing for the activities and agencies of the Department of Defense (other than the military departments) for operation and maintenance, leasing, and minor construction, as authorized by law, \$28,400,000.

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For use in the Homeowners Assistance Fund established pursuant to section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-754, as amended), \$133,000,000.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT, PART I

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account established by section 207(a)(1) of the Defense Authorization Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526), \$415,700,000, to remain available for obligation until September 30, 1995: *Provided*, That none of these funds may be obligated for base realignment and closure activities under Public Law 100-



526 which would cause the Department's \$1,800,000,000 cost estimate for military construction and family housing related to the Base Realignment and Closure Program to be exceeded: *Provided further*, That not less than \$134,600,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration.

**BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ACCOUNT,  
PART II**

**(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

For deposit into the Department of Defense Base Closure Account 1990 established by section 2906(a)(1) of the Department of Defense Authorization Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-510), \$1,618,600,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not less than \$308,900,000 of the funds appropriated herein shall be available solely for environmental restoration: *Provided further*, That an additional amount for the "Base Realignment and Closure Account, Part II" of \$69,000,000 shall be derived from the "Environmental Restoration, Defense" account of Public Law 102-172, to remain available until expended, and to be available solely for environmental restoration.

**GENERAL PROVISIONS**

SEC. 101. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be expended for payments under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract for work, where cost estimates exceed \$25,000, to be performed within the United States, except Alaska, without the specific approval in writing of the Secretary of Defense setting forth the reasons therefor.

SEC. 102. Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction shall be available for hire of passenger motor vehicles.

SEC. 103. Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction may be used for advances to the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, for the construction of access roads as authorized by section 210 of title 23, United States Code, when projects authorized therein are certified as important to the national defense by the Secretary of Defense.

SEC. 104. None of the funds appropriated in this Act may be used to begin construction of new bases inside the continental United States for which specific appropriations have not been made.

SEC. 105. Hereafter, no part of the funds provided in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used for purchase of land or land easements in excess of 100 per centum of the value as determined by the Army Corps of Engineers or the Naval Facilities Engineering Command, except (a) where there is a determination of value by a Federal court, or (b) purchases negotiated by the Attorney General or his designee, or (c) where the estimated value is less than \$25,000, or (d) as otherwise determined by the Secretary of Defense to be in the public interest.

SEC. 106. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be used to (1) acquire land, (2) provide for site preparation, or (3) install utilities for any family housing, except housing for which funds have been made available in annual Military Construction Appropriations Acts.

SEC. 107. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for minor construction may be used to transfer or relocate any activity from one base or installation to another,

without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 108. Hereafter, no part of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used for the procurement of steel for any construction project or activity for which American steel producers, fabricators, and manufacturers have been denied the opportunity to compete for such steel procurement.

SEC. 109. None of the funds available to the Department of Defense for military construction or family housing during the current fiscal year may be used to pay real property taxes in any foreign nation.

SEC. 110. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be used to initiate a new installation overseas without prior notification to the Committees on Appropriations.

SEC. 111. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts may be obligated for architect and engineer contracts estimated by the Government to exceed \$500,000 for projects to be accomplished in Japan or in any NATO member country, unless such contracts are awarded to United States firms or United States firms in joint venture with host nation firms.

SEC. 112. Hereafter, none of the funds appropriated in Military Construction Appropriations Acts for military construction in the United States territories and possessions in the Pacific and on Kwajalein Atoll may be used to award any contract estimated by the Government to exceed \$1,000,000 to a foreign contractor: *Provided*, That this section shall not be applicable to contract awards for which the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a United States contractor exceeds the lowest responsive and responsible bid of a foreign contractor by greater than 20 per centum.

SEC. 113. Hereafter, the Secretary of Defense is to inform the Committees on Appropriations and the Committees on Armed Services of the plans and scope of any proposed military exercise involving United States personnel thirty days prior to its occurring, if amounts expended for construction, either temporary or permanent, are anticipated to exceed \$100,000.

**(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

SEC. 114. Hereafter, unexpended balances in the Military Family Housing Management Account established pursuant to section 2831 of title 10, United States Code, as well as any additional amounts which would otherwise be transferred to the Military Family Housing Management Account, shall be transferred to the appropriations for Family Housing, as determined by the Secretary of Defense, based on the sources from which the funds were derived, and shall be available for the same purposes, and for the same time period, as the appropriation to which they have been transferred.

SEC. 115. Hereafter, not more than 20 per centum of the appropriations in Military Construction Appropriations Acts which are limited for obligation during the current fiscal year shall be obligated during the last two months of the fiscal year.

**(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

SEC. 116. Hereafter, funds appropriated to the Department of Defense for construction in prior years shall be available for construction authorized for each such military department by the authorizations enacted into law during the current session of Congress.

SEC. 117. Hereafter, the Secretary of Defense is to provide the Committees on Appro-

priations of the Senate and the House of Representatives with an annual report by February 15, containing details of the specific actions proposed to be taken by the Department of Defense during the current fiscal year to encourage other member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and Japan and Korea to assume a greater share of the common defense burden of such nations and the United States.

SEC. 118. Hereafter, for military construction or family housing projects that are being completed with funds otherwise expired or lapsed for obligation, expired or lapsed funds may be used to pay the cost of associated supervision, inspection, overhead, engineering and design on those projects and on subsequent claims, if any.

SEC. 119. Hereafter, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any funds appropriated to a military department or defense agency for the construction of military projects may be obligated for a military construction project or contract, or for any portion of such a project or contract, at any time before the end of the fourth fiscal year after the fiscal year for which funds for such project were appropriated if the funds obligated for such project (1) are obligated from funds available for military construction projects, and (2) do not exceed the amount appropriated for such project, plus any amount by which the cost of such project is increased pursuant to law.

SEC. 120. Of the funds appropriated in this Act for Operation and maintenance of Family Housing, no more than \$14,000,000 may be obligated for contract cleaning of family housing units.

**(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)**

SEC. 121. Hereafter, during the five-year period after appropriations available to the Department of Defense for military construction and family housing operation and maintenance and construction have expired for obligation, upon a determination that such appropriations will not be necessary for the liquidation of obligations or for making authorized adjustments to such appropriations for obligations incurred during the period of availability of such appropriations, unobligated balances of such appropriations may be transferred into the appropriation "Foreign Currency Fluctuations, Construction, Defense" to be merged with and to be available for the same time period and for the same purposes as the appropriation to which transferred.

SEC. 122. None of the funds appropriated in this Act, except those necessary to exercise construction management provisions under section 2807 of title 10, United States Code, may be used for study, planning, design, or architect and engineer services related to the relocation of Yongsan Garrison, Korea.

SEC. 123. Hereafter, such sums as may be necessary for annual pay raises for programs funded by Military Construction Appropriations Acts shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in each annual Military Construction Appropriations Act.

SEC. 124. Defense access roads for Camp McCain, Mississippi, shall be considered as fully meeting the certification requirements specified in section 210 of title 23 of the United States Code.

SEC. 125. The environmental response task force established in section 2923(c) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991 (Public Law 101-510; 104 Stat. 1821) shall reconvene and shall, until the date (as determined by the Secretary of Defense) on which all base closure activities required under title II of the Defense Authorization

Amendments and Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 101-526; 102 Stat. 2627) are completed—

(1) monitor the progress of relevant Federal and State agencies in implementing the recommendations of the task force contained in the report submitted under paragraph (1) of such section; and

(2) annually submit to the Congress a report containing—

(A) recommendations concerning ways to expedite and improve environmental response actions at military installations (or portions of installations) that are being closed or subject to closure under such title;

(B) any additional recommendations that the task force considers appropriate; and

(C) a summary of the progress made by relevant Federal and State agencies in implementing the recommendations of the task force.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through line 19, page 17, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of the bill through line 19, page 17?

If not, are there any amendments to the remainder of the bill?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota: Page 17, after line 19, insert the following new section:

SEC. 126. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, each amount appropriated by this Act is hereby reduced by one percent.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment on behalf of myself, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN].

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would cut \$85 million from this bill. Our intent on this and other appropriations bills is an attempt to reduce some of the overhead expenditures in the Federal Government.

That is going to be done in the legislative appropriations bill, and we would hope to be able to do it in all of the bills that come before us.

In the private sector, when you are in some difficulty, one of the first areas of budget restraint is in overhead or in indirect costs. That is almost always the first area of cutbacks.

At the Federal level, budgeting has generally been done by taking what you spent last year, adding inflation, and that becomes the baseline for what you need to spend next year. There is not and has not been restraint, in my judgment, with respect to indirect costs or overhead costs.

Mr. Chairman, we would like to see if we can exercise some restraint and propose some cuts on appropriation bills dealing with overhead and indirect expenditures.

This proposal would save \$85 billion. It does not target essential construction requirements of the Armed Forces. The reason that we are not proposing a greater cut in this bill is that this bill provides substantial moneys for the kinds of bricks and mortar, the actual construction, and not so much money for the overhead or indirect costs that relate to that construction.

Mr. Chairman, today we will offer an amendment to cut administrative overhead in H.R. 5428, the fiscal year 1993 military construction appropriations bill. Our amendment would reduce funding by 1-percent across the board.

Let me first say I understand and support the need to provide adequate housing for our military personnel and their families. This is a good business and good policy for any number of reasons. As we strike to deal with the issue of skyrocketing deficits, I also believe all areas of Federal spending need to be scrutinized for possible savings.

The amendment does not target essential military construction requirements of our Armed Forces. After consulting with the committees of jurisdiction, we believe that a 1-percent cut can achieve savings of \$85 million without impairing mission-essential projects.

We will establish legislative history in debate to ensure that this amendment cuts overhead, not essential projects or activities. We would focus cuts in such accounts as staff travel, transportation of goods, printing, communications, and office supplies and materials. There are three ways to achieve this goal:

Reduce funds for planning and design as military requirements recede;

Cut overhead for administration, supervision, and inspection that together amount to about 5 percent of each project; and

Shave other overhead costs for foreign bases as we begin the drawdown of troops abroad.

The end of the cold war provides an opportunity to demonstrate fiscal restraint. Sound management of tax dollars requires that we take action to do so. We believe that our amendment achieves budget discipline, but without hurting mission requirements, family housing, environmental cleanup, entitlements, or basing closing adjustments.

The need to tackle a deficit over \$400 billion compels us to root out waste, duplication, and excessive overhead in all bills this year. We welcome your support for this prudent amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dorgan-Penny-Boxer-Glickman amendment to reduce military construction appropriations 1 percent across-the-board. This amendment, which would save \$85 million, is intended to reduce overhead expenses. Adoption of the Dorgan-Penny amendment also brings the bill under the fiscal year 1992 appropriated level.

This amendment will not target essential military construction requirements established by the Appropriations Committee. Instead, we propose three ways to achieve the reduction: First, by reducing funds for planning and design as military requirements of our Armed Forces recede; second, by a cut in overhead for administration, supervision, and inspection that together amount to about 5 percent of each project; and three, to shave overhead costs for foreign bases as we begin the drawdown of troops abroad.

With a \$400 billion deficit, spending reductions are essential this year. We believe this amendment represents a responsible approach to reducing the overall level appropriation in this bill, and I urge the adoption of the amendment.

I thank the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] for sponsoring the amendment.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, we have this year, it has been said on the floor repeatedly, a deficit of over \$400 billion. The actual amount of the deficit is closer to \$470 billion. The only way you get to \$400 billion is by subtracting the \$70 billion in the Social Security reserves, that is, receipts over expenditures this year.

□ 1550

Of course, Mr. Chairman, that is not honest budgeting, but some do it, and, if we subtract that 70 billion, we ratchet down the deficit to \$400 billion.

The actual deficit this year, the operating budget deficit, is \$470 billion. We are in deep trouble, we are headed toward deeper trouble with this fiscal policy, and we have to do something about it, and it seems to me that we ought to, in every instance, try to trim spending, particularly with respect to overhead costs and indirect costs, and that will respect to at least \$85 million is the intent of this amendment, and we would ask for its favorable consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as I understand, the across-the-board amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] would cut the bill by about \$86 million. I also understand that this amendment is aimed at administrative expenses which are required to manage and supervise construction contracts, as well as architect and engineering de-



sign contracts. There are also administrative expenses associated with managing 400,000 existing family housing units.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's across-the-board amendment would undoubtedly place an undue strain on these administrative expenses. However I am assuming that this amendment will not impact on the quality-of-life projects in the military that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HEFNER] fights for and defends each year. The chairman and I both like to support the troops all the time, not just during the parades.

However, Mr. Chairman, I understand, as we all do, the need to cut costs, so I am not going to object to the amendment, but I will vote against the amendment.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, I understand the intent of the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN], but the amendment does not do what he says it does.

It does not target overhead accounts, it does not target design accounts. It says clearly, "notwithstanding any provision of this act, each amount appropriated by this act is hereby reduced by 1 percent."

Mr. Chairman, it is an across-the-board reduction. It will hit family housing. It will hit military construction. It will hit the place where our men and women in uniform live and work.

Mr. Chairman, the bill the committee has brought to the floor is very well crafted. In fact, the accounts will be, as I mentioned earlier, at the lowest level for military construction in family housing, at the lowest level since fiscal year 1982, at the lowest level in a decade. We are already below last year's spending levels, and now the author of the amendment wants to come back with an additional \$85.6 million reduction out of the hides of the women and men in our armed services.

Mr. Chairman, let me try to make this picture a little clearer because we are hustling troops home from Europe with little provisions for them now. We are cramming them into poor housing, and there are waiting periods of months for furniture and cars to arrive that are jammed in ports.

There is a 15-year veteran who waited 5 months for household goods while his family slept on air mattresses. The children's education is being disrupted. There are hardships causing financial problems and marital difficulties.

For example, at Fort Stewart, GA, a young sergeant, and his wife and two children are paying \$400 a month for a trailer, and the wind blows through it, and the floor tilts, and there is a swamp in the back yard.

The crowding is so severe that in May the Army began offering half-price meals to troops and members of

their families without kitchens in Fort Stewart and at other U.S. bases.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to cut an additional \$85.6 million. Affordable housing at Fort Stewart means housing as far as 100 miles away, and currently at that facility there is a 2-year wait for housing.

We have made reductions. The funding for our active components is down 41 percent over last year in the bill we have brought to the floor. How many other bills can say that they are at their lowest levels in over 10 years, as this bill is? The Guard and Reserve accounts are down 30 percent from last year, and, if we are worried about saving money abroad, the NATO infrastructure account is down 46 percent from last year.

We have already made reductions in this bill. This across-the-board cut will come out of the hides of our military personnel. It is not advisable, and, if my colleagues want to look at the environment, this bill has \$800 million for environmental cleanup at closed bases and for environmental compliance projects at various bases. Why do we want to go in and take another additional \$85 million across the board?

Mr. Chairman, this bill is well constructed, it is fiscally responsible, and this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LOWERY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I am trying to understand the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] too, and, as my colleagues know, I have no problem voting for a 1-percent cut, and I will vote for it, and the gentleman from California will be disappointed with me, but I just wanted to make clear just exactly what I am voting for here.

Is this amendment crafted so that, when I vote for it, instead of voting to reduce overhead expenses, I am, in fact, voting to cut military construction in the Army? Military construction in the Navy? Military construction in the Air Force? Military construction in defense agencies? North Atlantic Treaty infrastructure? Military construction in the National Guard? Military construction in the international guard? Military construction in the Army Reserve? Military construction in the Naval Reserve? Military construction in the Air Force Reserve?

Mr. Chairman, all those things are things—

Mr. LOWERY of California. The gentleman can also add to that family housing for all the services as well as for base closure and realignment. They would all be cut by 1 percent.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, when I get over to family housing, what I find there is that there was specific money in there for operation and maintenance.

Now, as I understand it, the intention was to cut that funding, but yet there were not amendments offered to cut the funding in operation and maintenance that clearly shows up as a line item under family housing.

But in addition to cutting that line item, then we would also be cutting the construction of homes with this amendment.

Mr. LOWERY of California. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is correct. This is not a targeted amendment. This is an amendment that cuts across the board.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN]. I think it is really unfortunate because today we are appropriating \$8.6 billion for 1993 military construction, family housing and base closure projects. This bill, while under the 602(b) allocations, is under the funding levels needed for these initiatives that this Congress deems important, such as the environmental cleanup of bases and providing for adequate quality of life for our servicemen and their families. But we did the best we can in these trying times. Let us not make any further cuts in this bill as the amendment of the gentleman would call for.

Mr. Chairman, this important bill affects the quality of life for those who are dedicated and sacrifice their lives for the protection of the rest of the United States. Even considering that we are in the process of closing or reorganizing over a hundred military bases, the state of family housing for service men and women is deplorable and the monies in this bill are for the improvement of their base housing.

Mr. Chairman, I have over here some pictures to illustrate the substandard housing we force our young men and women to live in as they prepare to put their lives on the line for the rest of us. Many in this House condemn the plight of our inner cities and the state of welfare housing. I ask them to take a look at the standard of housing found at many military installations. Now I want these same Members to offer this kind of amendment to cutting entitlements. Try it on entitlements, where the biggest spending occurs in this country. But, when we are already below what we need to provide quality housing for our military families, we face an attempt to cut their standard of living even further as we consider the amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] cutting military construction spending.

Mr. Chairman, many of my friends on the other side of the aisle continually lament about how we as a Nation should take care of the less fortunate, yet those same friends want to drastically cut back probably one of the best vehicles to help the poor when

they mandate cuts in Defense. The military trains and educates military personnel and gives self-esteem to the less fortunate ones who are trying to earn their living. Now they want to cause a further deterioration to living standards by cutting the housing for our service personnel.

When I say there are backlogs in family housing and the maintenance of these buildings, I am talking about a backlog of approximately \$6.8 billion. The Air Force has a \$2 billion backlog in construction. The Army has a \$1 billion backlog. The Navy and Marines have a \$3.8 billion backlog. This totals up to almost 1 year's expenditures in the whole bill.

□ 1600

Mr. Chairman, now, I just hope that all my colleagues will consider the seriousness of the Dorgan amendment when they put the faces of their constituents who are in the military. We know people serving their country in the military. Let us provide decent housing for them.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thought I heard the gentleman say, and I am not certain, that this cuts certain entitlements for military.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, no. What I was saying was that Members seem to come down here and want to prove that they are fiscally conservative by cutting certain bills. I applaud that in certain areas. But you are talking about a bill that has already been cut and is below last year's spending in providing military construction, even in light of the fact that we have tremendous backlogs and needs to provide decent housing for our military personnel.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I want to make the point that entitlements are not a part of this. So we are not intending to do this.

Mr. Chairman, let me make another point: with the end of the cold war, clearly the gentleman, the committee, everyone knows that we are going to have substantial reductions in a range of these appropriations bills dealing with this country's defense, including military construction. I think every one of us understands there would naturally be a reduction at the end of the cold war.

Our contention is this, that with respect to the overhead and the indirect costs in all Government programs, we think it is certainly achievable to save 1 percent of that budget without cutting into the muscle, without cutting into the effectiveness and the necessary programs that the gentleman is representing.

We do not think this is an egregious cut. We think it is just saying to those involved in the expenditure of this money, just as you would in a business or as you would in any other activity, look, times are tight. The deficit is very large. In the area of indirect costs, travel, copying, all of those kinds of overhead expenses, just cut back 1 percent.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, what I am saying is in this particular account you are doing serious damage to military construction because this particular account is below what we need just to provide for adequate housing for the scaled down military personnel.

What we are saying here is that we have a backlog right now of over \$6 billion of needs, even as we scale down. We still need decent housing for our military personnel.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Chairman, we have already done what the offerers of the amendment are requesting. In fact, we have done it far more dramatically than a mere 1 percent. This bill is already, as the committee has brought it to the floor, under last year's level. It is under already.

This bill has reduced by 41 percent, a reduction of \$1.4 billion, active component military construction and has reduced by 30 percent, \$186 million below last year's level, the reserve component for MILCON.

It is up 168 percent for base closure and realignment. Despite that increase of \$1.3 billion, we are still under last year's level.

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to note that we have had a series of significant votes this year regarding the budget and how to attack the budget deficit. We started the year with a vote on the budget walls. A majority of us in this Chamber decided to keep those walls up and to apply any savings in defense to reducing the deficit, instead of transferring those dollars over to domestic accounts. I think that was the right decision and it has helped us to make some progress in cutting the deficit.

We also not too long ago had a vote on the balanced budget amendment. A supermajority in this Chamber voted for that balanced budget amendment. Unfortunately, it fell nine votes short of passage by the two-thirds margin required.

I do think that it makes it incumbent upon all of us, regardless which

view Members took on that amendment, to do more during the appropriations process this year to reduce spending.

Mr. Chairman, one cannot support a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution and then argue against reasonable cuts when those opportunities are made available to us.

I think it might be instructive to note that some who would oppose this modest amendment to cut military construction last week voted to retain the superconducting super collider, which is one of the most expensive big ticket science projects ever to come along; one that we cannot afford in this climate of budget deficits; one that crowds all of the other significant scientific research that must move forward if we are going to build for a stronger future.

So it is somewhat disingenuous for those who have taken that position to add to the deficit to come here and lecture those of us offering this amendment today as if somehow we are inconsistent in our views on deficit spending.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there are many Members here that can point to a record as long as the one that I hold in terms of voting against big-ticket items in both the domestic agenda and the defense agenda, and few who could point to as many votes as I have cast to reign in the dramatically rising costs in the entitlement area.

We have to address all areas if we are going to get ahead of this deficit. This really is a modest amendment, a very meager step in the right direction. But I cannot think of a single project in this bill that could not shoulder a 1-percent cut, if that is what it comes to.

I simply want to reassert, however, that almost every one of these projects entails a lot of overhead expenditures. You can easily find those savings in that area without having to cut down on the construction projects themselves.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the ranking minority member and for the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMAS], but I do not want to say the cold war is over and we ought to be able to cut some of these appropriations, and some of them substantially.

Actually we spent in this area \$8.56 billion last year, and this bill is \$8.56 billion. It is only \$3 million less than last year, out of some \$8 billion in spending.

We are simply saying look, here is \$85 million. Let us trim it out of the overhead and indirect costs.

I understand my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY]. I respect the point the gentleman made.



The point the gentleman made is a point made every day on the floor of the House. It is fine to cut, but it is over the hill. It is the next bill we should cut, not this bill.

The fact is we never quite get over the hill, and I think this year we must look at the easiest areas of budget cutting, and that is to suggest we start tightening our belt with respect to overhead and indirect costs of government.

Mr. Chairman, that is all we are asking. This is a very modest cut in an \$8 billion bill. We are talking about \$85 million.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PENNY. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman quotes the bottom line of what this bill is, an \$8.6 billion bill, and says this is only \$3 million under last year's spending. But if the gentleman would read the bill, the gentleman would understand that \$2 billion of this bill is going for base closures that will save us money in the outyears. If you take that \$2 billion out of the \$8.6 billion, you will find it is \$1.7 billion below in real military construction funding, under last year's spending.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand the point the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] makes. The point I guess with respect to taxpayers is what are we spending today? What is it going to cost us as taxpayers? We are saying we would like it to cost about \$85 million less, and that is why we ask for the consideration of this amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear to all Members here that I intended to vote against the amendment. I do so for this reason: I would say that I think there has been a very good and constructive discussion here.

Let me point out to all Members the reason I intend to vote against the amendment. It is because if you do a comparison with the section 602 allocation, this bill is right at the allocation for budget authority and under allocation by \$126 million in outlays.

Going to last year's level, if you compare the bill with last year's level, for active components we are under that by \$1.4 billion, or a 41-percent reduction. It is under last year's level for the reserve components by \$186 million, or a 30-percent reduction. It is under last year's level for NATO by \$100 million,

or a 46-percent reduction. It is over last year's level for family housing by \$380 million, or a 10-percent increase, but let us point out again this comes back in the form of offsets and savings in the Defense budget.

It is over last year's level for base closures by \$1.3 billion, or a 168-percent increase, which again will bring a savings in the outyears. In comparison with the hard freeze level, we are under the hard freeze level for budget authority by \$2.6 million, and under the hard freeze level for budget authority by \$2.6 million, and under the hard freeze level for outlays by \$258 million.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to remind Members of these facts. That is why I will be voting against this amendment.

□ 1610

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, the 602(b) allocation that is talked about a lot, what would be the deficit if every budget was on the 602(b)?

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, it would be the same as the deficit projected in the budget resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Which is?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, as I understand it, it is about \$7 billion less than the President's.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, the point is, even if we stuck with 602 on every budget, we would still have a \$300 billion deficit; is that correct?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, give or take \$100 billion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 266, noes 156, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 214]

AYES—266

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Allen  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (TX)  
Annunzio  
Applegate  
Archer  
Armey

Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bacchus  
Ballenger  
Barrett  
Beilenson  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Billbray  
Billbrakis

Blackwell  
Billey  
Boehert  
Boehner  
Boxer  
Brewster  
Broomfield  
Brown  
Bruce  
Bryant

Bunning  
Burton  
Byron  
Camp  
Campbell (CA)  
Campbell (CO)  
Carper  
Chandler  
Clay  
Clement  
Coble  
Coleman (MO)  
Collins (IL)  
Collins (MI)  
Condit  
Cooper  
Cox (CA)  
Cox (IL)  
Coyne  
Crane  
Dannemeyer  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorgan (ND)  
Downey  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Durbin  
Dymally  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Emerson  
Engel  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Fawell  
Feighan  
Fields  
Flake  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Frost  
Gekas  
Gibbons  
Glitchest  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gordon  
Goss  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hancock  
Hastert  
Hayes (IL)  
Hayes (LA)  
Henry  
Herger  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Hopkins  
Horn  
Houghton  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Ireland

Jacobs  
James  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Johnston  
Jones (NC)  
Jontz  
Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kleczka  
Klug  
Kopetski  
Kostmayer  
Kyl  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Leach  
Lehman (CA)  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Lowey (NY)  
Luken  
Manton  
Markley  
Marlenee  
Martinez  
Matsui  
McCloskey  
McCrery  
McDermott  
McEwen  
McMillen (MD)  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Moakley  
Moody  
Morella  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Myers  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nichols  
Nowak  
Nussle  
Oaker  
Oberstar  
Olin  
Oliver  
Orton  
Owens (NY)  
Owens (UT)  
Panetta  
Parker  
Patterson  
Paxon  
Pease  
Pelosi  
Penny  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pickle  
Porter  
Poshard  
Price  
Pursell  
Quillen  
Rahall

Ramstad  
Rangel  
Ravenel  
Reed  
Regula  
Rhodes  
Rinaldo  
Ritter  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rostenkowski  
Roth  
Roukema  
Russo  
Sanders  
Santorum  
Savage  
Sawyer  
Scheuer  
Schulze  
Schumer  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sharp  
Shaw  
Shays  
Sikorski  
Slattery  
Slaughter  
Smith (FL)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solomon  
Spratt  
Staggers  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stump  
Swett  
Synar  
Tallion  
Tauzin  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traffant  
Unsold  
Upton  
Valentine  
Vander Jagt  
Vento  
Volkmer  
Walker  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weber  
Weiss  
Weldon  
Wheat  
Wise  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Wyllie  
Yatron  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

#### NOES—156

Alexander  
Anderson  
Andrews (NJ)  
Anthony  
Aspin  
Baker  
Barnard  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bennett  
Bentley  
Bevill  
Borski  
Boucher

Brooks  
Browder  
Bustamante  
Callahan  
Cardin  
Carr  
Chapman  
Clinger  
Coleman (TX)  
Combest  
Costello  
Coughlin  
Cramer  
Cunningham

Darden  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeLay  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dorman (CA)  
Dwyer  
Early  
Edwards (TX)  
English  
Evans  
Ewing  
Fasell

Fazio	Lewis (CA)	Ray	[Roll No. 215]	Packard	Russo	Swett
Flash	Lightfoot	Richardson	AYES—417	Pallone	Sabo	Swift
Foglietta	Livingston	Riggs		Panetta	Sanders	Synar
Ford (MI)	Lloyd	Roe		Parker	Sangmeister	Tallon
Gallely	Long	Rose		Pastor	Santorum	Tanner
Gallo	Lowery (CA)	Rowland		Patterson	Sarpallius	Tauzin
Gaydos	Machtley	Roybal		Paxon	Savage	Taylor (MS)
Gedensson	Martin	Sabo		Payne (NJ)	Sawyer	Taylor (NC)
Gephardt	Mavroules	Sarpallius		Payne (VA)	Saxton	Thomas (CA)
Geren	Mazzoli	Saxton		Pease	Schaefer	Thomas (GA)
Gillmor	McCandless	Schaefer		Pelosi	Scheuer	Thomas (WY)
Gonzalez	McCollum	Schiff		Penny	Schiff	Thornton
Goodling	McCurdy	Schroeder		Perkins	Schroeder	Torres
Green	McDade	Shuster		Peterson (FL)	Schulze	Torricelli
Hall (OH)	McGrath	Sisisky		Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Towns
Hammerschmidt	McHugh	Skaggs		Petri	Sensenbrenner	Trafiacant
Hansen	McMillan (NC)	Skeen		Pickett	Serrano	Unsoeld
Harris	Michel	Skelton		Pickle	Sharp	Upton
Hatcher	Mineta	Smith (IA)		Porter	Shaw	Valentine
Hefley	Mink	Smith (NJ)		Poshard	Shays	Vander Jagt
Hertel	Molinari	Spence		Price	Shuster	Vento
Holloway	Mollohan	Sundquist		Pursell	Sikorski	Visclosky
Horton	Montgomery	Swift		Quillen	Sisisky	Volkmer
Hoyer	Moorhead	Tanner		Rahall	Skaggs	Vucanovich
Hunter	Fish	Taylor (MS)		Ramstad	Skeen	Walker
Hutto	Morrison	Thomas (GA)		Rangel	Skelton	Walsh
Hyde	Murtha	Thornton		Ravenel	Slattery	Washington
Inhofe	Nagle	Visclosky		Ray	Slaughter	Waxman
Jenkins	Natcher	Vucanovich		Reed	Smith (FL)	Weber
Kanjorski	Obey	Walsh		Regula	Smith (IA)	Weiss
Kaptur	Ortiz	Washington		Rhodes	Smith (NJ)	Weldon
Kolbe	Oxley	Whitten		Riggs	Smith (OR)	Wheat
Kolter	Packard	Williams		Rinaldo	Smith (TX)	Whitten
Lagomarsino	Pallone	Wilson		Ritter	Snowe	Williams
Lancaster	Pastor	Wolf		Roberts	Solarz	Wilson
Laughlin	Payne (VA)	Yates		Roe	Solomon	Wise
Lehman (FL)	Perkins	Young (AK)		Roemer	Spence	Wolf
Lent	Pickett	Young (FL)		Rogers	Spratt	Wolpe

## NOT VOTING—12

Bonior	Hefner	Payne (NJ)
Conyers	Jones (GA)	Ridge
Edwards (OK)	LaFalce	Stallings
Ford (TN)	McNulty	Traxler

□ 1632

Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. LLOYD, and Messrs. BROOKS, GOODLING, and PACKARD changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. VALENTINE, DOOLEY, SYNAR, PAXON, and BILBRAY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. HOUGHTON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Appropriations Act, 1993".

Are there any further amendments to the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and support the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to, and that the bill, as amended do pass.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 417, noes 0, not voting 17, as follows:

Abercrombie	Dreier	Kaptur
Ackerman	Duncan	Kasich
Alexander	Durbin	Kennedy
Allard	Dwyer	Kennelly
Allen	Dymally	Kildee
Anderson	Early	Kleczka
Andrews (ME)	Eckart	Klug
Andrews (NJ)	Edwards (CA)	Kolbe
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Kolter
Annunzio	Emerson	Kopetski
Anthony	Engel	Kostmayer
Applegate	English	Kyl
Archer	Erdreich	Lagomarsino
Armey	Espy	Lancaster
Aspin	Evans	Lantos
Atkins	Ewing	LaRocco
AuCoin	Fascell	Laughlin
Bacchus	Fawell	Leach
Baker	Fazio	Lehman (CA)
Ballenger	Feighan	Lehman (FL)
Barnard	Fields	Lent
Barrett	Fish	Levin (MI)
Barton	Flake	Levine (CA)
Bateman	Foglietta	Lewis (CA)
Beilenson	Ford (MI)	Lewis (FL)
Bennett	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Bentley	Franks (CT)	Lightfoot
Bereuter	Frost	Lipinski
Bevill	Gallely	Livingston
Bilbray	Gallo	Lloyd
Bilirakis	Gaydos	Long
Blackwell	Gedensson	Lowery (CA)
Bliley	Gekas	Lowe (NY)
Boehlert	Gephardt	Luken
Boehner	Geren	Machtley
Borski	Gibbons	Manton
Boucher	Gilchrest	Markey
Boxer	Gillmor	Marlenee
Brewster	Gilman	Martin
Brooks	Gingrich	Martinez
Broomfield	Glickman	Matsui
Browder	Gonzalez	Mavroules
Brown	Goodling	Mazzoli
Bruce	Gordon	McCandless
Bryant	Goss	McCloskey
Bunning	Gradison	McCollum
Burton	Grandy	McCrery
Bustamante	Green	McCurdy
Byron	Guarini	McDade
Camp	Gunderson	McDermott
Campbell (CA)	Hall (OH)	McEwen
Campbell (CO)	Hall (TX)	McGrath
Cardin	Hamilton	McHugh
Carper	Hammerschmidt	McMillan (NC)
Carr	Hancock	McMillen (MD)
Chandler	Hansen	Meyers
Chapman	Harris	Mfume
Clay	Hastert	Michel
Clement	Hatcher	Miller (CA)
Clinger	Hayes (IL)	Miller (OH)
Coble	Hayes (LA)	Miller (WA)
Coleman (MO)	Hefley	Mineta
Coleman (TX)	Henry	Mink
Collins (IL)	Herger	Moakley
Collins (MI)	Hertel	Molinari
Combest	Hoagland	Mollohan
Condit	Hobson	Montgomery
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Moody
Costello	Holloway	Moorhead
Cox (IL)	Hopkins	Moran
Coyne	Horn	Morella
Cramer	Horton	Morrison
Crane	Houghton	Mrazek
Cunningham	Hoyer	Murphy
Dannemeyer	Hubbard	Murtha
Darden	Huckaby	Myers
Davis	Hughes	Nagle
de la Garza	Hunter	Natcher
DeFazio	Hutto	Neal (MA)
DeLauro	Hyde	Neal (NC)
DeLay	Inhofe	Nichols
Dellums	Ireland	Nowak
Derrick	Jacobs	Nussle
Dickinson	James	Oaker
Dicks	Jefferson	Oberstar
Dingell	Jenkins	Obey
Dixon	Johnson (CT)	Olin
Donnelly	Johnson (SD)	Oliver
Dooley	Johnson (TX)	Ortiz
Doollittle	Johnston	Orton
Dorgan (ND)	Jones (NC)	Owens (NY)
Dorman (CA)	Jontz	Owens (UT)
Downey	Kanjorski	Oxley

## NOES—0

## NOT VOTING—17

Berman	Edwards (OK)	Richardson
Bonior	Ford (TN)	Ridge
Callahan	Hefner	Stallings
Conyers	Jones (GA)	Traxler
Coughlin	LaFalce	Waters
Cox (CA)	McNulty	

□ 1651

Mr. EARLY changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. PANNETTA, having assumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5428) making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANNETTA). Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object. Mr. THOMAS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object, and on that I demand tellers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Thirty-six Members having stood, an insufficient number, a teller vote is not ordered.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, how many Members are in the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Forty-four is the required number to stand for a teller vote in the House.

Mr. WALKER. It is one-fifth, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. One-fifth of a quorum of the House.

The question was taken; and on a division, (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 256, noes 14.

So the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WALKER) there were—ayes 183, noes, 45.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. VOLKMER. The vote just taken, Mr. Speaker, was that a separate vote on the Dorgan amendment adopted in the Committee?

Mr. SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I object, and on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Speaker pro tempore appointed as tellers Mr. THOMAS of Georgia and Mr. WALKER.

□ 1700

The House divided, and the tellers reported that there were—yeas 177, nays 66.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANNETTA). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 412, noes 8, not voting 14, as follows:

(Roll No. 216)

AYES—412

Abercrombie	Annunzio	Ballenger
Ackerman	Anthony	Barnard
Alexander	Applegate	Barrett
Allard	Army	Bateman
Allen	Aspin	Beilenson
Anderson	Atkins	Bennett
Andrews (ME)	AuCoin	Bentley
Andrews (NJ)	Bacchus	Bereuter
Andrews (TX)	Baker	Berman

Bevill	Gallo	Machtley
Billbray	Gaydos	Manton
Bilbrakis	Gejdenson	Markey
Blackwell	Gekas	Marlenee
Bliley	Gephardt	Martin
Boehler	Geren	Martinez
Boehner	Gibbons	Matsui
Borski	Gilchrest	Mavroules
Boucher	Gillmor	Mazzoli
Boxer	Gilman	McCandless
Brewster	Glickman	McCloskey
Broomfield	Gonzalez	McCollum
Browder	Goodling	McCrery
Brown	Gordon	McCurdy
Bruce	Goss	McDade
Bryant	Gradison	McEwen
Bunning	Grandy	McGrath
Burton	Green	McHugh
Bustamante	Guarini	McMillan (NC)
Byron	Gunderson	McMillen (MD)
Callahan	Hall (OH)	Mfume
Camp	Hall (TX)	Michel
Campbell (CA)	Hamilton	Miller (CA)
Campbell (CO)	Hammerschmidt	Miller (OH)
Cardin	Hancock	Miller (WA)
Carper	Hansen	Mineta
Carr	Harris	Mink
Chandler	Hastert	Moakley
Chapman	Hatcher	Molinar
Clay	Hayes (IL)	Mollohan
Clement	Hayes (LA)	Montgomery
Clinger	Hefley	Moody
Coble	Henry	Moorhead
Coleman (MO)	Herger	Moran
Coleman (TX)	Hertel	Morella
Collins (IL)	Hoagland	Morrison
Collins (MI)	Hobson	Mrazek
Combest	Hochbrueckner	Murphy
Condit	Holloway	Murtha
Conyers	Hopkins	Myers
Cooper	Horn	Nagle
Costello	Horton	Natcher
Coughlin	Houghton	Neal (MA)
Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Neal (NC)
Cox (IL)	Hubbard	Nichols
Coyne	Huckaby	Nowak
Cramer	Hughes	Nussle
Crane	Hutto	Oaker
Cunningham	Hyde	Oberstar
Darden	Inhofe	Obey
Davis	Ireland	Olin
de la Garza	Jacobs	Oliver
DeFazio	James	Ortiz
DeLauro	Jefferson	Orton
DeLay	Jenkins	Owens (NY)
Dellums	Johnson (CT)	Owens (UT)
Derrick	Johnson (SD)	Oxley
Dickinson	Johnson (TX)	Packard
Dicks	Johnston	Pallone
Dingell	Jones (NC)	Panetta
Dixon	Jontz	Parker
Donnelly	Kanjorski	Pastor
Dooley	Kaptur	Patterson
Doolittle	Kasich	Paxon
Dorgan (ND)	Kennedy	Payne (NJ)
Dornan (CA)	Kennelly	Payne (VA)
Downey	Kildee	Pease
Dreier	Kleczka	Pelosi
Duncan	Klug	Penny
Durbin	Kolbe	Perkins
Dwyer	Kolter	Peterson (FL)
Dymally	Kopetski	Peterson (MN)
Early	Kostmayer	Petri
Eckart	Kyl	Pickett
Edwards (TX)	Lagomarsino	Pickle
Emerson	Lancaster	Porter
Engel	Lantos	Poshard
English	LaRocco	Prie
Erdreich	Laughlin	Quillen
Espy	Leach	Rahall
Evans	Lehman (CA)	Ramstad
Ewing	Lehman (FL)	Rangel
Fascell	Lent	Ravenel
Fawell	Levin (MI)	Ray
Fazio	Levine (CA)	Reed
Feighan	Lewis (CA)	Regula
Fields	Lewis (FL)	Rhodes
Fish	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Flake	Lightfoot	Riggs
Foglietta	Lipinski	Rinaldo
Ford (MI)	Livingston	Ritter
Ford (TN)	Lloyd	Roberts
Frank (MA)	Long	Roe
Franks (CT)	Lowery (CA)	Roemer
Frost	Lowey (NY)	Rogers
Galleghy	Luken	Ros-Lehtinen

Rose	Smith (FL)	Trafficant
Rostenkowski	Smith (IA)	Unsoeld
Roth	Smith (NJ)	Upton
Roukema	Smith (OR)	Valentine
Rowland	Smith (TX)	Vander Jagt
Roybal	Snowe	Vento
Russo	Solarz	Visclosky
Sabo	Solomon	Volkmer
Sanders	Spence	Vucanovich
Sangmeister	Spratt	Walsh
Santorum	Staggers	Washington
Sarpalus	Stark	Waters
Savage	Stearns	Waxman
Sawyer	Stenholm	Weber
Saxton	Stokes	Weiss
Schaefer	Studds	Weldon
Scheuer	Stump	Wheat
Schiff	Sundquist	Whitten
Schroeder	Sweet	Williams
Schulze	Swift	Wilson
Schumer	Synar	Wise
Serrano	Tallon	Wolf
Sharp	Tanner	Wolpe
Shaw	Tauzin	Wyden
Shays	Taylor (MS)	Wylie
Shuster	Taylor (NC)	Yates
Sikorski	Thomas (CA)	Yatron
Siskaly	Thomas (GA)	Young (AK)
Skaggs	Thomas (WY)	Young (FL)
Skeen	Thornton	Zeliff
Skelton	Torres	Zimmer
Slattery	Torricelli	
Slaughter	Towns	

#### NOES—8

Archer	Meyers	Sensenbrenner
Barton	Pursell	Walker
Dannemeyer	Rohrbacher	

#### NOT VOTING—14

Bonior	Hefner	McNulty
Brooks	Hunter	Ridge
Edwards (CA)	Jones (GA)	Stallings
Edwards (OK)	LaFalce	Traxler
Gingrich	McDermott	

□ 1725

So the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. MYERS OF INDIANA

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANNETTA). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I am, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MYERS of Indiana moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5428, to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 390, noes 33, not voting 11, as follows:

## [Roll No. 217]

## AYES—390

Abercrombie	Dorgan (ND)	Kanjorski
Ackerman	Dornan (CA)	Kaptur
Alexander	Downey	Kasich
Allen	Durbin	Kennedy
Anderson	Dwyer	Kennelly
Andrews (ME)	Dymally	Kildee
Andrews (NJ)	Early	Kleczka
Andrews (TX)	Eckart	Klug
Annunzio	Edwards (CA)	Kolbe
Anthony	Edwards (TX)	Kolter
Applegate	Emerson	Kopetski
Aspin	Engel	Kostmayer
Atkins	English	Kyl
AuCoin	Erdreich	Lagomarsino
Bacchus	Espy	Lancaster
Baker	Evans	Lantos
Ballenger	Ewing	LaRocco
Barnard	Fascell	Laughlin
Barrett	Fazio	Leach
Barton	Feighan	Lehman (CA)
Bateman	Fish	Lehman (FL)
Bennett	Flake	Lent
Bentley	Foglietta	Levin (MI)
Bereuter	Ford (MI)	Levine (CA)
Berman	Ford (TN)	Lewis (CA)
Bevill	Frank (MA)	Lewis (FL)
Bilbray	Franks (CT)	Lewis (GA)
Billakis	Frost	Lightfoot
Blackwell	Gallely	Lipinski
Billey	Gallo	Livingston
Boehlert	Gaydos	Lloyd
Boehner	Gejdenson	Long
Borski	Gekas	Lowery (CA)
Boucher	Gephardt	Lowey (NY)
Boxer	Geren	Lukens
Brewster	Gibbons	Machtley
Brooks	Gilchrest	Manton
Broomfield	Gillmor	Markey
Browder	Gilman	Martin
Brown	Gingrich	Martinez
Bruce	Glickman	Mavroules
Bryant	Gonzalez	Mazzoli
Bunning	Goodling	McCandless
Burton	Gordon	McCloskey
Bustamante	Gradison	McCollum
Byron	Grandy	McCrery
Callahan	Green	McCurdy
Campbell (CA)	Guarini	McDade
Campbell (CO)	Gunderson	McDermott
Cardin	Hall (OH)	McEwen
Carper	Hall (TX)	McGrath
Carr	Hamilton	McHugh
Chandler	Hammerschmidt	McMillan (NC)
Chapman	Hansen	McMillen (MD)
Clay	Harris	Mfume
Clement	Hastert	Michel
Clinger	Hatcher	Miller (CA)
Coble	Hayes (IL)	Miller (OH)
Coleman (MO)	Hayes (LA)	Miller (WA)
Coleman (TX)	Hefley	Mineta
Collins (IL)	Herger	Mink
Collins (MI)	Hertel	Moakley
Combust	Hoagland	Molinaro
Condit	Hobson	Mollohan
Conyers	Hochbrueckner	Montgomery
Cooper	Holloway	Moody
Costello	Hopkins	Moorhead
Coughlin	Horn	Moran
Cox (CA)	Horton	Morella
Cox (IL)	Houghton	Morrison
Coyne	Hoyer	Mrazek
Cramer	Hubbard	Murtha
Cunningham	Huckaby	Nagle
Dannemeyer	Hughes	Natcher
Darden	Hunter	Neal (MA)
Davis	Hutto	Neal (NC)
de la Garza	Hyde	Nichols
DeFazio	Inhofe	Nowak
DeLauro	Ireland	Oakar
DeLay	James	Oberstar
Dellums	Jefferson	Obey
Derrick	Jenkins	Olin
Dickinson	Johnson (CT)	Oliver
Dicks	Johnson (SD)	Ortiz
Dingell	Johnson (TX)	Orton
Dixon	Johnston	Owens (NY)
Donnelly	Jones (NC)	Owens (UT)
Dooley	Jontz	Packard

Pallone	Sabo
Panetta	Sanders
Parker	Sangmeister
Pastor	Sarpalius
Patterson	Savage
Paxon	Sawyer
Payne (NJ)	Saxton
Payne (VA)	Schaefer
Pease	Schiff
Pelosi	Schroeder
Penny	Schulze
Perkins	Schumer
Peterson (FL)	Serrano
Peterson (MN)	Sharp
Petri	Shaw
Pickett	Shays
Pickle	Shuster
Porter	Sikorski
Poshard	Sisisky
Price	Skaggs
Quillen	Skeen
Rahall	Skelton
Rangel	Slattery
Ravenel	Slaughter
Ray	Smith (FL)
Reed	Smith (IA)
Regula	Smith (NJ)
Rhodes	Smith (OR)
Richardson	Smith (TX)
Riggs	Snowe
Rinaldo	Solarz
Ritter	Solomon
Roe	Spence
Roemer	Spratt
Rogers	Staggers
Rohrabacher	Stearns
Ros-Lehtinen	Stenholm
Rose	Stokes
Rostenkowski	Studds
Roukema	Stump
Rowland	Sundquist
Roybal	Swett

## NOES—33

Allard	Goss
Archer	Hancock
Armey	Henry
Beilenson	Jacobs
Camp	Meyers
Crane	Murphy
Doolittle	Myers
Dreier	Nussle
Duncan	Oxley
Fawell	Pursell
Fields	Ramstad

Roberts	Young (AK)
Roth	Young (FL)
Russo	Zimmer
Santorum	
Scheuer	
Sensenbrenner	
Stark	
Upton	
Walker	
Wylie	
Zeliff	

## NOT VOTING—11

Bonior	LaFalce
Edwards (OK)	Marlenee
Hefner	Matsui
Jones (GA)	McNulty

## □ 1743

Mr. STARK changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. GEKAS changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

## □ 1745

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PANETTA). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of approving the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 271, nays 123, answered "present" 1, not voting 39, as follows;

## [Roll No. 218]

## YEAS—271

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Oliver
Ackerman	Gillmor	Ortiz
Anderson	Gilman	Orton
Andrews (ME)	Glickman	Owens (NY)
Andrews (NJ)	Gonzalez	Owens (UT)
Andrews (TX)	Gordon	Packard
Annunzio	Gradison	Pallone
Anthony	Green	Panetta
Applegate	Guarini	Parker
Archer	Gunderson	Pastor
Aspin	Hall (TX)	Patterson
Atkins	Hamilton	Payne (NJ)
AuCoin	Hammerschmidt	Payne (VA)
Bacchus	Harris	Pease
Bateman	Hatcher	Pelosi
Beilenson	Hayes (IL)	Penny
Bennett	Hayes (LA)	Perkins
Bevill	Hertel	Peterson (FL)
Bilbray	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)
Blackwell	Hochbrueckner	Petri
Billey	Horn	Pickett
Boehlert	Horton	Pickle
Boehner	Houghton	Porter
Borski	Hoyer	Poshard
Boucher	Hubbard	Price
Boxer	Huckaby	Rahall
Brewster	Hughes	Rangel
Brooks	Hutto	Ravenel
Broomfield	Hyde	Ray
Browder	Jenkins	Reed
Brown	Johnson (SD)	Richardson
Bruce	Johnson (TX)	Rinaldo
Bryant	Johnston	Ritter
Bunning	Jones (NC)	Roe
Burton	Jontz	Roemer
Bustamante	Kanjorski	Rose
Byron	Kaptur	Rostenkowski
Callahan	Kasich	Roth
Campbell (CA)	Kennedy	Rowland
Campbell (CO)	Kennelly	Roybal
Cardin	Kildee	Russo
Carper	Kleczka	Sabo
Carr	Kolter	Sanders
Chandler	Kopetski	Sangmeister
Chapman	Kostmayer	Sarpalius
Clay	Lancaster	Savage
Clement	Lantos	Sawyer
Clinger	LaRocco	Scheuer
Coble	Laughlin	Schulze
Coleman (MO)	Lehman (CA)	Schumer
Coleman (TX)	Levin (MI)	Sharp
Collins (IL)	Levine (CA)	Sisisky
Collins (MI)	Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
Combust	Lipinski	Skeen
Condit	Lloyd	Skelton
Conyers	Long	Slattery
Cooper	Dicks	Slaughter
Costello	Dingell	Smith (FL)
Coughlin	Dixon	Smith (IA)
Cox (CA)	Donnelly	Smith (NJ)
Cox (IL)	Dooley	Snowe
Coyne	Dorgan (ND)	Solarz
Cramer	Dreier	Spratt
Cunningham	Durbin	Stark
Dannemeyer	Dymally	Stenholm
Darden	Early	Stokes
Davis	Edwards (CA)	Studds
de la Garza	Edwards (TX)	Swett
DeFazio	Engel	Swift
DeLauro	English	Synar
DeLay	Erdreich	Tallan
Dellums	Espy	Tanner
Derrick	Evans	Tauzin
Dickinson	Fascell	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	Fazio	Thomas (GA)
Dingell	Feighan	Thornton
Dixon	Fish	Torres
Donnelly	Flake	Torricelli
Dooley	Foglietta	Towns
	Ford (MI)	Trafficant
	Ford (TN)	Unsoeld
	Frank (MA)	Vander Jagt
	Frost	Vento
	Gaydos	Visclosky
	Gejdenson	Volkmer
	Gephardt	Waters
	Geren	Waxman



Weiss	Wilson	Wyllie
Wheat	Wise	Yatron
Whitten	Wolpe	
Williams	Wyden	

## NAYS—123

Allard	Goss	Nussle
Allen	Grandy	Paxon
Armey	Hancock	Purcell
Baker	Hansen	Quillen
Ballenger	Hastert	Ramstad
Barrett	Hefley	Regula
Barton	Henry	Rhodes
Bentley	Hergert	Riggs
Bereuter	Hobson	Roberts
Bilirakis	Holloway	Rogers
Bliley	Hopkins	Rohrabacher
Boehrlert	Ireland	Roe-Lehtinen
Boehner	Jacobs	Roukema
Broomfield	James	Santorum
Bunning	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Burton	Klug	Schaefer
Camp	Kolbe	Schroeder
Campbell (CA)	Kyl	Sensenbrenner
Chandler	Lagomarsino	Shaw
Coble	Leach	Shays
Coleman (MO)	Lent	Shuster
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Sikorski
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Smith (OR)
Crane	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Cunningham	Livingston	Solomon
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Stearns
DeLay	Marlenee	Stump
Dickinson	McCandless	Sundquist
Doolittle	McCollum	Taylor (NC)
Dorman (CA)	McCrery	Thomas (CA)
Duncan	McDade	Thomas (WY)
Emerson	McEwen	Upton
Ewing	McMillan (NC)	Vucanovich
Fawell	Meyers	Walker
Franks (CT)	Michel	Weber
Gallely	Miller (OH)	Weldon
Gallo	Miller (WA)	Wolf
Gekas	Molinar	Young (AK)
Gilchrist	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Gingrich	Morella	Zeliff
Goodling	Murphy	Zimmer

## ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Martin

## NOT VOTING—39

Alexander	Hunter	Nagle
Barnard	Inhofe	Oxley
Berman	Jefferson	Ridge
Bonior	Jones (GA)	Schiff
Campbell (CO)	LaFalce	Serrano
Davis	Lehman (FL)	Spence
Downey	Machtley	Staggers
Dwyer	Manton	Stallings
Eckart	Markey	Traxler
Edwards (OK)	Mavroules	Valentine
Fields	McHugh	Walsh
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Washington
Hefner	Mrazek	Yates

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARNETT). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WALKER moves that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 131, noes 264, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

## AYES—131

Allard	Hefley	Pursell
Allen	Henry	Quillen
Armey	Hergert	Rahall
Baker	Hobson	Ravenel
Ballenger	Holloway	Regula
Barrett	Hopkins	Rhodes
Bateman	Horton	Riggs
Bentley	Houghton	Rinaldo
Bilirakis	Hunter	Roberts
Bliley	Inhofe	Roe
Boehner	Ireland	Rogers
Broomfield	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Johnson (TX)	Roth
Burton	Kasich	Santorum
Callahan	Klug	Saxton
Camp	Kolbe	Schaefer
Clinger	Kyl	Schiff
Coleman (MO)	Lagomarsino	Sensenbrenner
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Shaw
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Shuster
Crane	Lightfoot	Skeen
Cunningham	Livingston	Smith (OR)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Snowe
Davis	Marlenee	Solomon
DeLay	Martin	Spence
Dickinson	McCandless	Spratt
Doolittle	McCollum	Stearns
Dorman (CA)	McCrery	Stump
Duncan	McEwen	Sundquist
Eckart	McGrath	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McMillan (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Fish	Meyers	Thomas (WY)
Franks (CT)	Michel	Upton
Gallely	Miller (WA)	Vander Jagt
Gallo	Molinar	Vucanovich
Gekas	Moorhead	Walker
Gilchrist	Murphy	Walsh
Gilmore	Myers	Weber
Gingrich	Nichols	Wolf
Gradison	Nussle	Wyllie
Grandy	Packard	Young (AK)
Gunderson	Paxon	Young (FL)
Hancock	Penny	Zimmer
Hastert	Porter	

## NOES—264

Abercrombie	Clement	Ford (MI)
Ackerman	Coble	Ford (TN)
Anderson	Coleman (TX)	Frank (MA)
Andrews (ME)	Collins (IL)	Frost
Andrews (NJ)	Collins (MI)	Gaydos
Andrews (TX)	Combest	Gedensson
Annunzio	Condit	Gephardt
Anthony	Cooper	Geren
Applegate	Costello	Gibbons
Archer	Cox (IL)	Gilman
Aspin	Coyne	Glickman
Atkins	Cramer	Gonzalez
Auten	Darden	Goodling
Bacchus	de la Garza	Gordon
Barton	DeFazio	Goss
Beilenson	DeLauro	Green
Bennett	Dellums	Guarini
Bereuter	Derrick	Hall (OH)
Berman	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Bevill	Dingell	Hamilton
Bilbray	Dixon	Hammerschmidt
Blackwell	Donnelly	Hansen
Boehrlert	Dooley	Harris
Borski	Dorgan (ND)	Hatcher
Boucher	Dreier	Hayes (IL)
Boxer	Durbin	Hayes (LA)
Brewster	Dwyer	Hoagland
Brooks	Early	Hochbrueckner
Browder	Edwards (CA)	Horn
Brown	Edwards (TX)	Hoyer
Bruce	Emerson	Hubbard
Bryant	Engel	Huckaby
Bustamante	Erdreich	Hughes
Byron	Espy	Hutto
Campbell (CA)	Evans	Jacobs
Campbell (CO)	Fascell	James
Cardin	Fawell	Jenkins
Carper	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Carr	Feighan	Johnston
Chandler	Flake	Jones (NC)
Clay	Foglietta	Jontz

Kanjoraki	Natcher	Schroeder
Kaptur	Neal (MA)	Schumer
Kennedy	Neal (NC)	Sharp
Kennelly	Nowak	Shays
Kildee	Oaker	Sikorski
Kleczka	Obey	Siskisky
Kolter	Olin	Skaggs
Kopetaki	Oliver	Skelton
Kostmayer	Ortiz	Slattery
Lancaster	Orton	Slaughter
Lantos	Owens (NY)	Smith (FL)
LaRocco	Owens (UT)	Smith (NJ)
Laughlin	Pallone	Smith (TX)
Leach	Panetta	Solarz
Lehman (CA)	Parker	Stark
Lent	Pastor	Stenholm
Levin (MI)	Patterson	Stokes
Levine (CA)	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Lewis (GA)	Payne (VA)	Swett
Lipinski	Pease	Swift
Lloyd	Pelosi	Synar
Long	Perkins	Tanner
Lowey (NY)	Peterson (FL)	Tauzin
Luken	Peterson (MN)	Taylor (MS)
Matsui	Petri	Thomas (GA)
Mavroules	Pickett	Thornton
Mazoli	Pickle	Torres
McCloskey	Poshard	Torricelli
McCurdy	Price	Towns
McDade	Ramstad	Trafiacant
McDermott	Ray	Unsoeld
McMillen (MD)	Reed	Valentine
Mfume	Roemer	Vento
Miller (CA)	Roe-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Miller (OH)	Rose	Volkmer
Mineta	Rostenkowski	Waters
Mink	Roukema	Waxman
Moakley	Rowland	Weiss
Mollohan	Roybal	Weldon
Montgomery	Russo	Wheat
Moody	Sabo	Whitten
Moran	Sanders	Wilson
Morella	Sangmeister	Wise
Morrison	Sarpalius	Wolpe
Mrazek	Savage	Wyden
Murtha	Sawyer	Yatron
Nagle	Scheuer	Zeliff

## NOT VOTING—39

Alexander	Jefferson	Richardson
Barnard	Jones (GA)	Ridge
Bonior	LaFalce	Ritter
Chapman	Lehman (FL)	Schulze
Conyers	Machtley	Serrano
Downey	Manton	Smith (IA)
Dymally	Markey	Staggers
Edwards (OK)	Martinez	Stallings
English	McHugh	Tallion
Fields	McNulty	Traxler
Hefner	Oberstar	Washington
Hertel	Oxley	Williams
Hyde	Rangel	Yates

□ 1827

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5427, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT 1993

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-609) on the resolution (H. Res. 499) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5427) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PARNETTA). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 336, nays 49, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—336

Abercrombie	Dreier	Kopetski
Ackerman	Duncan	Kostmayer
Allard	Durbin	Lagomarsino
Allen	Dwyer	Lancaster
Anderson	Early	Lantos
Andrews (ME)	Eckart	LaRocco
Andrews (NJ)	Edwards (CA)	Laughlin
Andrews (TX)	Edwards (TX)	Lehman (CA)
Annuzio	Engel	Lent
Anthony	English	Levin (MI)
Applegate	Erdreich	Levine (CA)
Aspin	Espy	Lewis (CA)
Atkins	Evans	Lewis (FL)
Bacchus	Ewing	Lewis (GA)
Barrett	Fasell	Lipinski
Bateman	Fawell	Livingston
Bellenson	Fazio	Lloyd
Bennett	Feighan	Long
Bentley	Flake	Lowey (NY)
Berman	Foglietta	Luken
Bevill	Ford (MI)	Machtley
Bilbray	Ford (TN)	Manton
Bilirakis	Frank (MA)	Markey
Blackwell	Gallagher	Marlenee
Bliley	Gallo	Martin
Boehert	Gaydos	Martinez
Boehner	Gedensson	Matsui
Borski	Gephardt	Mavroules
Boucher	Geren	Mazzoli
Boxer	Gibbons	McCandless
Brewster	Gillmor	McCloskey
Brooks	Glickman	McCollum
Browder	Gonzalez	McCrery
Brown	Goodling	McCurdy
Bruce	Gordon	McDermott
Bryant	Gradison	McGrath
Bunning	Grandy	McMillan (NC)
Bustamante	Green	McMillen (MD)
Byron	Guarini	Meyers
Camp	Gunderson	Mfume
Campbell (CO)	Hall (OH)	Michel
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Miller (CA)
Carper	Hamilton	Miller (OH)
Carr	Hansen	Miller (WA)
Chandler	Harris	Mineta
Clement	Hastert	Mink
Clinger	Hatcher	Moakley
Coleman (MO)	Hayes (IL)	Molinar
Coleman (TX)	Hayes (LA)	Mollohan
Collins (IL)	Hefley	Montgomery
Collins (MI)	Henry	Moody
Condit	Herger	Moorhead
Conyers	Hoagland	Moran
Cooper	Hochbrueckner	Morella
Costello	Hopkins	Mrazek
Coughlin	Horn	Murphy
Cox (IL)	Houghton	Murtha
Coyne	Hoyer	Myers
Cramer	Hubbard	Nagle
Crane	Huckaby	Natcher
Cunningham	Hughes	Neal (MA)
Dannemeyer	Hutto	Neal (NC)
Darden	Jacobs	Nichols
de la Garza	Jefferson	Nowak
DeFazio	Johnson (CT)	Oakar
DeLauro	Johnson (SD)	Oberstar
Dellums	Johnson (TX)	Obey
Derrick	Jones (NC)	Oliver
Dickinson	Jontz	Ortiz
Dicks	Kanjorski	Orton
Dingell	Kaptur	Owens (NY)
Dixon	Kennedy	Owens (UT)
Donnelly	Kennelly	Oxley
Dooley	Kildee	Packard
Doollittle	Kleczka	Pallone
Downey	Kolter	Panetta

Parker	Sarpallus
Pastor	Savage
Patterson	Sawyer
Paxon	Saxton
Payne (NJ)	Scheuer
Payne (VA)	Schiff
Pease	Schroeder
Pelosi	Schulze
Penny	Schumer
Perkins	Sensenbrenner
Peterson (FL)	Serrano
Peterson (MN)	Shaw
Pickett	Shays
Pickle	Shuster
Poshard	Sikorski
Price	Siskisky
Quillen	Skaggs
Ravenel	Skeen
Ray	Skeltan
Reed	Slattery
Regula	Slaughter
Richardson	Smith (FL)
Rinaldo	Smith (IA)
Roberts	Smith (NJ)
Roemer	Smith (OR)
Rogers	Smith (TX)
Rohrabacher	Snowe
Rose	Solarz
Rostenkowski	Spence
Roukema	Spratt
Rowland	Staggers
Roybal	Stark
Russo	Stearns
Sabo	Stenholm
Sanders	Stokes
Sangmeister	Studds

NAYS—49

Archer	Gilman
Armey	Gingrich
Baker	Goss
Ballenger	Hammerschmidt
Barton	Hancock
Bereuter	Hobson
Burton	Holloway
Callahan	Inhofe
Campbell (CA)	James
Coble	Kolbe
DeLay	Kyl
Dornan (CA)	Leach
Emerson	Lightfoot
Fields	McEwen
Franks (CT)	Morrison
Gekas	Porter
Gilchrist	Rahall

NOT VOTING—49

Alexander	Horton	Petri
AuCoin	Hunter	Pursell
Barnard	Hyde	Rangel
Bonior	Ireland	Rhodes
Broomfield	Jenkins	Ridge
Chapman	Johnston	Ritter
Clay	Jones (GA)	Roe
Combust	Kasich	Sharp
Cox (CA)	Klug	Stallings
Davis	LaFalce	Traxler
Dorgan (ND)	Lehman (FL)	Vander Jagt
Dymally	Lowery (CA)	Vento
Edwards (OK)	McDade	Washington
Fish	McHugh	Williams
Frost	McNulty	Yates
Hefner	Nussle	
Hertel	Olin	

□ 1847

Mr. RIGGS changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

#### ADJOURNMENT

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1992, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the President's determination that a waiver for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Romania, Russia, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402, of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(d)(1); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

3791. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—Even Start, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3792. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting notice of Final Regulations—the State Supported Employment Services Program; the State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program; Special Projects and Demonstrations for Providing Transitional Rehabilitation Services to Handicapped Youth; and Special Projects and Demonstrations for Providing Supported Employment Services to Individuals with Severe Handicaps and Technical Assistance Projects, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions of Joseph S. Hulings, of Virginia, Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States to the Republic of Turkmenistan, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3794. A letter from the Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the report on verification of the START Treaty, pursuant to section 37 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3795. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 92-28, with respect to eligibility of the Comoros to be furnished defense articles and services under the Foreign Assistance Act and the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3796. A letter from the Inspector General, General Services Administration, transmitting a copy of the Adult Report Register of his Office, including all financial recommendations, for the 6-month period ending March 31, 1992, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3797. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3798. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3799. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement,



Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3800. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

3801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting international fishery agreements for highly migratory species to which the United States is a party, pursuant to Public Law 101-627, section 105(a) (104 Stat. 4440); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3802. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of a report on Washington State marine mammals; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

3803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidential Determination No. 92-31, waiver with respect to the emigration practices of Tajikistan and Turkmenistan will substantially promote the objectives of section 402 of the Trade Act of 1974, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2432(c)(2)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3804. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the Indian Health Service Loan Repayment Program, pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 1616a; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Interior and Insular Affairs.

3805. A letter from the Chairman, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a report on the actuarial status of the railroad retirement system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 321f-1; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

3806. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the 1992 annual report on the financial status of the railroad unemployment insurance system, pursuant to 45 U.S.C. 369; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

3807. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended, to provide for the transfer of funds from the Harbor Maintenance trust fund to a new Marine Navigation trust fund to support nautical charting and marine navigational safety programs and activities, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation, Ways and Means, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 5100. A bill to strengthen the international trade position of the United States; with an amendment (Rept. 102-607). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint

Resolution 306. Resolution to designate the Port Chicago Naval Magazine as a National Memorial; with amendments (Rept. 102-608). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 499. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill H.R. 5427 making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 102-609). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. MILLER of California: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3168. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to provide for leases of certain lands for oil and gas purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committees on Armed Services and Energy and Commerce for a period ending not later than July 24, 1992, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of those committees pursuant to clause 1 (c), and (h), rule X, respectively (Rept. 102-610, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARNARD:

H.R. 5460. A bill to authorize a study of the feasibility and suitability of designating the Augusta Canal National Historic Landmark District as a National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ERDREICH:

H.R. 5461. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the regular investment tax credit for property placed in service during a specified period; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WEBER, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. ARMEY, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. COX of California, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. EWING, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HOLLOWAY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MFUME, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. SHAYS, and Mrs. BENTLEY):

H.R. 5462. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage corporations to provide financing

and management support services to small business concerns operating in urban areas designated as enterprise zones; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLLOWAY:

H.R. 5463. A bill to extend until January 1, 1996, the existing suspension of duty on certain chemicals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 5464. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve and make more efficient the provision of medical and health insurance information, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. CLINGER, and Mr. DE LUCA):

H.R. 5465. A bill to amend title XIII of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 relating to aviation insurance; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. CLINGER):

H.R. 5466. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to enhance competition among air carriers by prohibiting an air carrier who operates a computer reservation system from discriminating against other air carriers participating in the system and among travel agents which subscribe to the system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. TORRES, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COLORADO, Mr. DE LUCA, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. GONZALEZ):

H.R. 5467. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to permit extended participation by disadvantaged small business concerns in business development programs; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RICHARDSON:

H.R. 5468. A bill to provide tax incentives for businesses locating on Indian reservations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHULZE (for himself, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. COYNE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. SHAW, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. HORTON, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. MACHTELEY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. WOLF, Mr. ROSE, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RITTER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MC MILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. YATRON, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARLENEE, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 5469. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from the gross estate the value of land subject to a qualified conservation easement if certain conditions are satisfied and to defer some of the scheduled reduction in estate tax rates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DICKS (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MCCURDY, and Mr. SPRATT):

H. Con. Res. 336. Concurrent resolution calling for parallel actions to respond to reductions in strategic nuclear weapons announced by the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. NAGLE:

H. Con. Res. 337. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the General Accounting Office should conduct a study of the economic impacts of Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Order No. 636 on residential, commercial, and other end-users of natural gas, and that the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission should refrain from processing restructuring proceedings pursuant to such order until 60 days after the completion of such study; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 5470. A bill to permit refund of customs duties on certain drawback entries upon presentation of certificates of delivery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWDER:

H.R. 5471. A bill to clear certain impediments to the licensing of a vessel for employment in the coastwise trade and fisheries of the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 5472. A bill to clear certain impediments to the documentation of the vessel *S/V Dragon*; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 371: Mr. HUCKABY.

H.R. 713: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. ATKINS, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 999: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1241: Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1468: Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1500: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. GILCREST, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1536: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 1573: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. FROST, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. HATCHER.

H.R. 1623: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 2012: Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 2149: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2164: Mr. ATKINS and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2304: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 2691: Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 2898: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3164: Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 3236: Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 3349: Mr. QUILLLEN.

H.R. 3613: Mr. DIXON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. GORDON, Ms. DELAULO, and Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 3625: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 4002: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.

H.R. 4008: Mr. ECKART, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4063: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 4080: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 4083: Mr. SABO and Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 4206: Mr. ANTHONY and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 4243: Mr. DAVIS, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SABO, Mr. WISE, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. VALENTINE.

H.R. 4259: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4361: Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 4399: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 4406: Mr. GILCREST.

H.R. 4438: Mr. ROE.

H.R. 4457: Mr. DELLUMS, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 4507: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 4595: Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 4613: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4725: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 4849: Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 4897: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 5012: Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 5048: Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. SLATTERY, and Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 5100: Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 5123: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ESPY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.R. 5150: Mr. ATKINS and Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 5153: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 5159: Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 5191: Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. OLIN, Mr. CAMP, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HORN, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 5237: Mr. LAUGHLIN and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 5238: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 5282: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 5294: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 5317: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 5320: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 5323: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 5325: Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 5360: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 5421: Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. KYL, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PARKER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.J. Res. 152: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. WALSH.

H.J. Res. 353: Mr. MORRISON, Mr. PRICE, and Mr. TANNER.

H.J. Res. 398: Ms. HORN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. WALSH, Mr. ERDREICH, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. KASICH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. FROST, Ms. KENNELLY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. FISH.

H.J. Res. 399: Mr. DICKS and Mr. THOMAS of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 458: Mr. BRYANT, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. FISH, Mrs. KENNELLY, and Mr. SWETT.

H.J. Res. 460: Mr. EVANS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. HOAGLAND.

H.J. Res. 463: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 474: Mr. HAMILTON and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.J. Res. 478: Ms. NORTON, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. SPRATT, and Mr. OBEY.

H.J. Res. 483: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 495: Mr. SHAW, Mrs. MINK, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, and Mr. POSHARD.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, and Mr. BREWSTER.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mr. TORRICELLI, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H. Con. Res. 309: Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

H. Con. Res. 324: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. PRICE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. PERKINS.

H. Con. Res. 325: Mr. NAGLE and Mr. MILLER of California.

H. Res. 399: Mr. GEREN of Texas and Mr. WYLLIE.

H. Res. 490: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. RAVENEL, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. LANTOS.